SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
10017055585

Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

BX
8235
W6

METHODISM

AND THE

Centennial of American Independence;

OR,

THE LOYAL AND LIBERAL SERVICES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH DURING THE FIRST CENTURY OF THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES:

WITH A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE VARIOUS BRANCHES OF METHODISM, AND FULL STATISTICAL TABLES.

BY

REV. E. M. WOOD, Ph. D.

EZRA ORGAN
1838-1912.

I have a presentiment that God Almighty designed America to be free and independent, and that a great American Methodist people will be gathered in this country.—*Bishop Asbury.*

NEW YORK:
NELSON & PHILLIPS.
CINCINNATI:
HITCHCOCK & WALDEN.
1876.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1876, by

NELSON & PHILLIPS,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress at Washington.

DEDICATION.

TO THE MEMORY OF

Our lamented Christian Fathers of the First Century of the Great Republic,
and to all now living who love the Religious and Civil Prosperity
of the United States, and especially to the Youth of our
land who are to become responsible for the defense
and perpetuity of our glorious Institutions
during the next Century, is this
volume respectfully
dedicated

BY ITS AUTHOR.

Draw, 11-25-57

CONTENTS.

PART I.

LOYAL AND PATRIOTIC SERVICES.

Chapter		Page
	Introduction	9
I.	John Wesley a Friend of the American Colonies	13
II.	Asbury's Adoption of the American Cause and Country	38
III.	Loyalty of the Native Ministry and Membership	44
IV.	The Constitution of the Church Loyal	57
V.	Protests against National Evils	66
VI.	The Public School Question: Denominational or Common Schools	80
VII.	The Public School Question: Christian Aspect of Common Law	95

PART II.

LIBERAL CHARACTER AND TENDENCY OF THE CHURCH.

I.	Liberal Views of Church Government	111
II.	The Origin of Episcopacy: Prelatical and Erroneous Opinions	125
III.	The Origin of Episcopacy: Liberal and True Doctrine	141
IV.	How Methodism in Great Britain failed to become Episcopal: Wesley's Desire and Efforts to make it such	163
V.	Dilemma of British Methodism	175

CHAPTER PAGE

VI. HOW THE METHODIST CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES BECAME EPISCOPAL — THE EPISCOPACY A STRONG BOND OF UNION 192

VII. OFFICES IN THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT MINISTRY 208

VIII. THE NATURE OF THE PRESIDING ELDERSHIP 219

IX. CHOOSING OR APPOINTING PASTORS — MINISTERIAL TERM IN CITIES 230

X. POWERS OF THE LAITY: RECEPTION AND EXPULSION OF MEMBERS 247

XI. POWERS OF THE LAITY — LAY DELEGATION — REVENUES 265

XII. WOMEN'S WORK IN THE CHURCH 282

XIII. LIBERALITY OF DOCTRINE 295

XIV. METHODS OF PROPAGANDISM 304

XV. DEVELOPMENT AND LIBERAL TENDENCY—CHANGES PROPOSED 335

XVI. PROVIDENTIAL FAVOR ATTENDING THE CHURCH 355

XVII. BRIEF HISTORY OF OTHER METHODISMS IN THE UNITED STATES 368

XVIII. UNION OF METHODISMS 372

APPENDIX 383

INTRODUCTION.

WE have no desire long to detain the attention of the reader. We presume that he cares but little to know who we are personally if we but clearly present the thoughts we have to offer, and if those thoughts are, in themselves, instructive. He need not be told that the topics discussed are timely and fresh, for, though they may appear so to us, they may not so present themselves to him. If, however, they should seem to him trite, we trust he will "hear us for our cause," and then decide according to his sovereign pleasure. Any words of commendation to an intelligent public cannot induce a favorable conclusion. We trust that after reading the following action of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at its session of 1872, respecting the matters herein treated, our little book will be deemed a tract for the times.

GENERAL CONFERENCE ACTION.

"Whereas, the fourth of July, 1876, will be the centennial anniversary of the Declaration of American Independence; and,

"Whereas, a loyal and patriotic sentiment must prompt every citizen to join in some appropriate commemoration of the event; and,

"Whereas, the Methodist Church was the first, through a deputation of her chief ministers, to give a pledge of support to the Government in the days of Washington;

and, ever maintaining an unswerving loyalty, was second to none in the struggle for the perpetuation of that government in the days of Lincoln,

"Therefore, it is meet that we, the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, formally express our gratification that Congress has directed timely arrangements to be made for the celebration of this first National Centenary.

"Furthermore, while all loyal people will be prompted by their patriotism to participate in the commemorative ceremonies thus appointed, it will be an occasion on which our Church and people will seek, by appropriate religious services, to declare their faith in, and cognizance of, the overruling providence of Almighty God, and especially that under his guidance our fathers, by their heroism and sacrifices, maintained the Declaration of Independence, and by their wisdom and devotion established our Republican institutions; that under his favor our country has enjoyed during the century long intervals of peace, and an unprecedented prosperity; that under his blessings those arts and sciences and forms of industry which develop the resources of a land and elevate the character of a people have been fostered; that under his providence the means of intelligence have been multiplied, the cause of education promoted, and our free-school system, the fruit of American Protestantism and the bulwark of American freedom firmly established; that under his control the nation has been led to abolish slavery and reinvest the emancipated with every civil and political right; that under his restraints, during the prosperous periods of peace and the terrible seasons of war, our people, by respect to authority and obedience to law, have proven to the world that governments may be permanent where man is free; and that, under his special care, our Church has been protected in her religious liberty, and our people

have shared in the common happiness and prosperity; therefore be it by this General Conference

"*Resolved*, 1. That the Centenary of American Independence shall be appropriately celebrated by all our Churches and people with devout thanksgiving to Almighty God, by special religious services, and liberal thank-offerings.

"*Resolved*, 2. That the thanksgiving services shall begin with the first Sabbath of June in 1876, and close on the fourth day of July, to be celebrated at such times and places as may best suit the convenience of the Societies.

"*Resolved*, 3. That the primary object shall be the spiritual improvement of our people, especially by reviewing what God hath wrought for our Nation, and by cultivating feelings of gratitude to Him for the benefits of civil and religious liberty.

"*Resolved*, 4. That this gratitude shall have an appropriate expression of pecuniary contributions from our people according to the measure of their ability, so to be appropriated as to increase the efficiency of our denomination in promoting the welfare of our country.

"*Resolved*, 5. That as the Church and State, by their respective agencies, are brought into a more direct and vital co-operation in the education of the people than at any other point of their distinct movements, and as our Church does directly promote the welfare of the country by her educational institutions, therefore a most fitting commemoration of the National Centenary will be liberal offerings from our people to strengthen those educational institutions.

"*Resolved*, 6. That the gifts of our people shall be devoted to the cause of education, and shall be applied either to a *local* or a *general object*. The *local object* shall be the endowment of educational institutions under the patronage of our Annual Conferences, and the increase of existing educational funds. The *general object* shall be the

aid of needy young men called to the ministry, or needy young women called to the missionary work in our Church, in preparing for their respective spheres of duty, and the contributions for this object, together with all contributions not designated for other objects, shall constitute a fund to be known as the *National Centenary Fund*, to be held in trust and administered by the Board of Education of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the principal forever to remain intact—the interest alone to be used for the above-named purposes, under such regulations as the General Conference shall from time to time prescribe.

"*Resolved*, 7. That each Annual Conference shall in 1874 provide for a memorial discourse to be delivered before its own body during its session first preceding the fourth of July, 1876, and shall during its session in 1875 give the necessary directions to secure in all our Churches the observance of the commemorative services in 1876 recommended by the Board of Bishops.

"*Resolved*, 8. That the Board of Bishops shall devise a programme of religious services for the fitting commemoration of the event, and each Bishop shall present it to the annual conferences over which he may preside during 1875, and bring this action of the General Conference to the timely notice of the Annual Conferences.

"*Resolved*, 9. That the Board of Bishops shall prepare a commemorative address, and present it to the next General Conference on the first day of the session, to be immediately published to the Church, with such recommendations from the General Conference as will enlist all our people in the cheerful and devout observance of those special thanksgiving services which shall be the most appropriate and fervent expression of gratitude to Almighty God, of faith in Jesus Christ the Saviour and Ruler of the world, of love to our country, and of loyalty to the free institutions which are based upon the immortal Declaration."—*Journal of Gen. Conf.*, 1872.

METHODISM

AND THE

AMERICAN CENTENNIAL.

PART I.

LOYAL AND PATRIOTIC SERVICES.

CHAPTER I.

John Wesley a Friend of the American Colonies.

DURING the period of the American Revolution there were few greater men in England than JOHN WESLEY. His writings were, for the most part, largely read by all classes, especially what he wrote upon the American question, the then great subject of national thought and disquisition. These writings show that Wesley was friendly to the American cause. As a prevenient fact to the showing of this, however, let us note the nature of his loyalty to the king.

In 1744 he said, speaking for himself and his societies, they were "steadily attached to his Majesty's royal person and illustrious house, and ready to obey him to the uttermost in all things which they con-

ceived *to be agreeable to* the written word of God."—*Tyerman*, vol. i, p. 439. Again, he said, in 1774, "We cannot, indeed, say or do either more or less than we apprehend consistent with the *written word of God;* but we are ready to obey your Majesty to the uttermost in all things *which we conceive to be agreeable thereto.*"—*Wesley's Works*, vol. iii, p. 310.

Here are two extracts from his life separated by a period of thirty years, and bearing directly on the character of his loyalty to the king. Instead of it being a slavish loyalty, is it not the most intelligent, liberal, and scriptural kind of obedience? We hesitate not to say that it is such obedience as any and every citizen is bound by the word of God and an enlightened conscience to render to *all* who are in authority, be their office what it may. Wesley was not, then, a violent monarchist, though certainly not a republican. But there was in his great heart sympathy for all oppressed people, and an utter hatred of tyranny. It has been affirmed that all through the critical period of our Revolutionary War he was our enemy. This we deny, and proceed at once to make good that denial.

As a general principle, John Wesley was opposed to war. He says, "What an amazing way of deciding controversies! What must mankind be, before such a thing as war could ever be known or thought of upon earth! How shocking, how inconceivable, a want must there have been of common understand-

ing, as well as common humanity, before any two governors or any two nations in the universe could once think of such a method of decision."—*Wesley's Works*, vol. v, p. 512.

To Wesley war was an "amazing," "shocking" way of deciding national controversies. But most men consider that if ever war be justifiable it is in case of an invasion. There were two instances of this kind in the life-time of Wesley. Jackson, in his "Life of Charles Wesley," says, (p. 520,) "Mr. John Wesley, it would appear from a passage in one of his brother's letters, advised some of his men to learn the military exercise, that they might be better prepared to *defend* their country and home in case the threat of invasion (by the French, 1756) should be carried into execution." This much he could do without contradicting the general principle by which he was governed in his opposition to the dreadful arbitrament of the sword to decide questions of controversy.

It also appears that about the year 1780 the kingdom was again in imminent danger of invasion. Wesley then offered to raise some troops for its defense; but in two years after this he writes thus: "Two or three years ago, when the kingdom was in imminent danger, I made an offer to the Government of raising some men. The secretary of war (by the king's order) wrote me word that it was not necessary; but if ever it should be necessary his Majesty would let me know. I never renewed the offer, and never in-

tended it; but Captain Webb, without my knowing any thing of the matter, went to Col. B., the new secretary of war, and renewed that offer."—*Works*, vol. vii, p. 81. Wesley seems here to reflect upon this offer to engage in the defense of his country and home. The offer was so seemingly contrary to his general principles upon war, that he appears to have regretted immediately that he had even made the offer, and says he "*never intended*" *to renew it.*

Having proven that Wesley was in general opposed to war, we will now establish the particular fact that he was opposed to the English treatment of the American question; that he was opposed to the British Government making war upon the Colonies. And if we show this, will it not prove his sympathy with the Colonies?

In 1770, in a tract entitled "Free Thoughts on Public Affairs," he says, "I do not defend the measures which have been taken with regard to America; I doubt whether any man can defend them, either on the foot of *law*, *equity*, or *prudence*."

On Feb. 9, 1775, both houses of Parliament informed the king that the colonists were in rebellion, and requested the king to take the most effective measures to enforce obedience. The king's reply was a request to Parliament to increase both the naval and military forces. This meant to prepare for war against the Colonies. John Wesley, in about two weeks, preached an impressive sermon on the "horrid

effects of a civil war," in which he said "that of all scourges from God war was the most to be deprecated, because it often swept away all traces of religion, and even of humanity." Even his text was suggestive: "Let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing *mercy to the poor;* if it may be a *lengthening* of thy *tranquillity.*" Dan. iv, 27. This discourse adds proof to our former proposition, that Wesley deprecated war. Five years before, as we have seen, he had publicly blamed the Government for not "showing mercy to the poor" Colonies, and now he urges England to "break off her sins" and not engage in the war, that there might be a "lengthening of her tranquillity."

For a long time he fondly hoped and prayed that England might not engage in war with the Colonies. In May 19, 1775, he wrote to Mr. Rankin, then in America, saying, "Never was there a time when it was more necessary for all that fear God, both in England and in America, to wrestle with God in mighty prayer. In all the other judgments of God the inhabitants of the earth learn righteousness; but wherever war breaks out God is forgotten, if he be not set at open defiance. What a glorious work of God was at Cambuslang and Kilsyth from 1740 to 1744! But the war that followed tore it all up by the roots, and left scarce any trace of it behind."

We here publish in full his celebrated letter to

Lord North, prime minister of England, a copy of which was sent to Dartmouth, the secretary of the colonies. It is taken from Macmillan's Magazine, 1871.

The following remarkable letter from John Wesley to Lord Dartmouth, the then colonial secretary, which, through the kindness of the present earl, is for the first time published from the original in the archives of his family, cannot fail to be read with much interest and instruction at a juncture in many respects like that at which its burning words were called forth. It is the kind of letter, *mutatis mutandis*, that ought to have been written by the pope to the emperor of the French at the unprovoked beginning of the present war, or by any French ecclesiastic who believes that his country is laboring under a fatal illusion in refusing to acknowledge its defeat, and in believing that the loss of an inch of territory is the destruction of the whole nation. It might even be written by some German pastor or professor, who thinks that he might persuade the king or Count Bismarck to moderate, for the sake of peace, even their just demands. That Wesley was right we now all acknowledge. It is possible that had any one of the personages whom we have imagined so spoken, they might have been right also.

"MY LORD :—I would not speak—as it may seem to be concerning myself with things that lie out of my province—but I dare not refrain from it any longer. I think silence in the present case would be a sin against God, against my country, and against my own soul.

"But what hope can I have of doing good, of making the least impression upon your lordship, where so many have spoken in vain, and those far better qualified to speak on so delicate a subject?

"They were better qualified in some respects; in others they were not. They had not less bias upon their minds. They were not free from worldly hopes and fears. Their passions

were engaged: and how easily do these blind the eyes of the understanding? They were not more impartial. Most of them were prejudiced in the highest degree. They neither loved the king nor his ministers. Rather, they hated them with a perfect hatred. And your lordship knowing this, if you was a man, could not avoid having some prejudice to them; in which case it would be hardly possible to feel the full force of their arguments.

"They had not better means of information, of knowing the real tempers and sentiments, either of the Americans on the one hand, or of the English, Irish, and Scots on the other. Above all, they trusted in themselves, in their own power of convincing and persuading. I trust only in the living God, who hath the hearts of all men in his hand.

"And whether my writing do any good or no, it need do no harm. For it rests within your lordship's breast, whether any eye but your own shall see it.

"All my prejudices are against the Americans. For I am a high-churchman, the son of a high-churchman, bred up from my childhood in the highest notions of passive obedience and non-resistance. And yet, in spite of all my rooted prejudice, I cannot avoid thinking (if I think at all) that an oppressed people asked for nothing more than their legal rights, and that in the most modest and inoffensive manner which the nature of the thing would allow. But waiving this, waiving all considerations of right and wrong, I ask, 'Is it common sense to use force toward the Americans?'

"A letter now before me says, 'Four hundred of the regulars and forty of the militia were killed in the last skirmish.' What a disproportion! And this is the first essay of raw men against regular troops!

"You see, my lord, whatever has been affirmed, these men will not be frightened. And it seems they will not be conquered so easily as was at first imagined. They will probably dispute every inch of ground, and, if they die, die sword in hand.

"Indeed, some of our valiant officers say, 'Two thousand men

will clear America of these rebels.' No, nor twenty thousand, nor perhaps treble that number, be they rebels or not. They are as strong men as you; they are as valiant as you, if not abundantly more valiant. For they are one and all enthusiasts; enthusiasts for liberty. They are calm, deliberate enthusiasts. And we know how this principle

> "'Breathes into softest souls stern love and war,
> And thirst of vengeance, and contempt of death.'

We know men animated with this will leap into a fire or rush upon a cannon's mouth.

"'But they have no experience of war.' And how much more have our troops? How few of them ever saw a battle? 'But they have no discipline.' That is an entire mistake. Already they have near as much as our army. And they will learn more of it every day. So that in a short time they will understand it as well as their assailants.

"'But they are divided among themselves, so you are informed by various letters and memorials.' So, I doubt not, was poor Rehoboam informed concerning the ten tribes. So (nearer our times) was Philip informed concerning the people of the Netherlands. No, my lord, they are terribly united; not in the province of New England only, but down as low as the Jerseys and Pennsylvania the bulk of the people are so united that to speak a word in favor of the present English measures would almost endanger a man's life. Those who inform me of this (one of whom was with me last week, lately came from Philadelphia) are no sycophants; they say nothing to curry favor; they have nothing to gain or lose by me. But they speak with sorrow of heart what they have seen with their eyes and heard with their own ears.

"Those men think, one and all, be it right or wrong, that they are contending *pro aris et focis*, for their wives, children, and liberty. What advantage have they herein over men that fight only for pay? none of whom care a straw for the cause wherein they are engaged, most of whom strongly disapprove it.

"Have they not another considerable advantage? Is there occasion to recruit the troops? Their supplies are at hand, all round about them; ours are three thousand miles off.

"Are we then able to conquer the Americans, suppose they are left to themselves? Suppose all our neighbors stand stock still, and leave us and them to fight it out? But are we sure of this? Are we sure that all our neighbors will stand stock still? I doubt they have not promised it. And if they had, could we rely upon those promises?

"Yet it is not probable they will send ships or men to America. Is there not a shorter way? Do they not know where England and Ireland lie? And have they not troops as well as ships in readiness? All Europe is well apprised of this; only the English know nothing of the matter. What if they find means to land but ten thousand men? Where are the troops in England or Ireland to oppose them? Why, cutting the throats of their brethren in America! Poor England in the meantime!

"'But we have our militia, our valiant, disciplined militia; these will effectually oppose them.' Give me leave, my lord, to relate a little circumstance of which one then on the spot informed me. In 1716 a large body of militia were marching toward Preston against the rebels. In a wood which they were marching by a boy happened to discharge his fowling-piece. The soldiers gave all for lost, and by common consent threw down their arms and ran for life. So much dependence is to be placed on our valorous militia!

"But, my lord, this is not all. We have thousands of enemies, perhaps more dangerous than French or Spaniards. They are landed already; they fill our cities, our towns, our villages. As I travel four or five thousand miles every year, I have an opportunity of conversing freely with more persons of every denomination than any one else in the three kingdoms. I cannot, therefore, but know the general disposition of the people, English, Scots, and Irish; and I know a huge majority of them are exasperated almost to madness. Exactly so they were throughout England and Scotland about the year 1640, and in great measure by that same means; by inflammatory

papers, which were spread, as they are now, with the utmost diligence in every corner of the land. Hereby the bulk of the people were effectually cured of all love and reverence of the king. So that, first despising, then hating him, they were just ripe for open rebellion. And I assure your lordship so they are now; they want nothing but a leader.

"Two circumstances more deserve to be considered: the one, that there was at that time a general decay of trade, almost throughout the kingdom; the other, that there was an uncommon dearness of provisions. The case is the same in both respects at this day. So that even now there are multitudes of people that, having nothing to do and nothing to eat, are ready for the first bidder; and that, without inquiring into the merits of the cause, would flock to any that would give them bread.

"Upon the whole, I am really sometimes afraid that 'this evil is of the Lord.' When I consider (to say nothing of ten thousand other vices shocking to human nature) the astonishing *luxury* of the rich, and the *profaneness* of rich and poor, I doubt whether general dissoluteness of manners does not demand a general visitation. Perhaps the decree is already gone forth from the Governor of the world. Perhaps even now,

> "'As he that buys surveys a ground,
> So the destroying angel measures it around.
> Calm he surveys the perishing nation,
> Ruin behind him stalks, and empty desolation.'

"But we Englishmen are too wise to acknowledge that God has any thing to do in the world! Otherwise should we not seek him by fasting and prayer before he lets the lifted thunder drop? O, my lord, if your lordship can do any thing let it not be wanting! For God's sake, for the sake of the king, of the nation, of your lovely family, remember Rehoboam! Remember Philip the Second! Remember King Charles the First!

"I am, with true regard, my lord, your lordship's obedient servant, JOHN WESLEY.

"*June* 15, 1775, *in the way to Dublin.*"

It will be observed that in Mr. Wesley's letter to Lord North he says: "A letter now before me says, 'Four hundred of the regulars and forty of the militia were killed in the last skirmish.' What a disproportion! And this is the first essay of raw men against regular troops." That this was the battle of Lexington and Concord will appear evident from two considerations: first, it was about the number killed in that battle; and, second, the battle of Bunker Hill, the next in order, occurred June 17th, 1775, only *two days* after the letter to Lord North was written. At that time no news could have reached England in *two days.* But as the battle of Lexington and Concord occurred April 19th, 1775, this gives ample time for the news to reach Wesley before the 15th of June, 1775, the date of his letter to Lord North.

Tyerman says of these letters (vol. iii, p. 200) that they "are full of warnings and foresight, which were terribly fulfilled, and for fidelity, fullness, terseness—in short, for *multum in parvo*—were, perhaps, without a parallel in the correspondence of these ministers of state." It was certainly a clear and emphatic plea for the colonies when he said of them "that an *oppressed* people asked for nothing more than their *legal rights*, and that in the most *modest* and *inoffensive* manner which the nature of the thing would allow."

In this letter, addressed to the prime minister, Lord North, Wesley tried to persuade England not

to engage in war with the colonies, as the letter clearly proves. He first tried to prove that "they [the colonies] ask for nothing but their legal rights." He then says: "But waiving this, waiving all considerations of right and wrong, I ask, *Is it common sense to use force toward the Americans?* You see, my lord, whatever has been affirmed, these men will not be frightened. And it seems they will not be conquered as easily as was first imagined. They will probably dispute every inch of ground, and if they die, die sword in hand." What prophetic words! It is abundantly clear that Mr. Wesley sought to prevent *force* being used against the Americans.

Again, October 20, 1775, he wrote to Mr. Rankin in America: "I am entirely of your mind. I am persuaded love and tender measures will do far more than violence. And if I should have an interview with a great man, [probably Lord North,] which seems to be not unlikely, I will tell him so without circumlocution." All the above certainly proves our founder's sympathy with the cause of the American colonies.

But, again, Wesley, instead of being a "despotic monarchist," and an enemy to the colonies all through the Revolution, was known to belong to a class of liberal-minded men in England—liberal in religion and liberal in politics.

He was a descendant of a long line of Nonconformists, such as are now known as Dissenters. His

paternal great-grandfather, and both of his grandfathers, were Nonconformists. And although his father and mother were not recognized as Dissenters, but in some respects entertained high-church principles, yet that they were not "despotic monarchists," but very liberal in their views, may be seen from the following instances. Whitehead says (p. 24) that at one time "he absolutely refused [while he was chaplain] to read the king's declaration, and though surrounded with courtiers, soldiers, and informers, he preached a bold and pointed discourse against it from Dan. iii, 17, 18: 'If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up.'" Whitehead says of this event that "in this noble instance of integrity and firmness of mind Mr. Wesley has given us an unequivocal proof that a person of high-church principles may be a true friend to the Protestant cause and the liberty of the subject." This was the liberal kind of loyalty entertained by John Wesley's father, and the very true and wise comment upon it. He was not a "despotic monarchist."

There are two instances in the life of John Wesley's mother which prove her liberality. During her husband's absence in London, on official business, she conducted public services in her own house on Sab-

bath evening; and her son, John, said of her, that she was "a preacher of righteousness."—*Whitehead*, p. 38. This conduct enraged some of the clergymen. and was by them considered a departure from the practices of the Church of England. The other instance is the case of Thomas Maxfield, a person connected with one of Mr. Wesley's Societies, who, though but a carpenter, undertook to preach. When John Wesley learned of it he hastened home to put a stop to his preaching. Mrs. Wesley, John's mother, approved of Maxfield's preaching, and said to her son, "John, take care what you do with respect to that young man, for he is as surely called of God to preach as you are. Examine what have been the fruits of his preaching, and hear him yourself."—*Tyerman*, p. 369. These two instances show the liberality of her views, and that she was practically a Dissenter. She was no "despotic monarchist."

Thus it is seen that John Wesley was blessed with a liberal-minded ancestry, and was himself, as we might anticipate from such a lineage and his practical character he would be, really more of a Dissenter than a high-Churchman. His liberal views of doctrine and church polity and loyalty make it a positive insult to call him "a despotic monarchist."

It is true that John Wesley never wished to be *called* a Dissenter. Yet no one knew better than he of his many variations from the order of the Church

of England. We believe that Tyerman has fairly and fully expressed this double church relation of Wesley: "Having founded Churches, or Societies, as he persisted in calling them, he proceeded to provide and to *ordain*—yes, to *ordain*—for them ministers. He was a clergyman of the Episcopal Church of England, *with the views of a Dissenter*, and acting accordingly, there was, of course, in his future proceedings much that was incongruous and perplexing."—Vol. i, p. 511. On page 510 the same author also says: "It is not too much to say that from the time of reading the book of Lord King Wesley's principles of ecclesiastical polity were substantially the same as those of Dissenters." To call a man of such liberal views of religious doctrines and church polity, notwithstanding his loyalty to the king, a "despotic monarchist," is certainly as far from the truth as it is deficient in honesty and good taste.*

But during the colonial trouble John Wesley was the intimate friend of some of those who were high in office and known to be friends of the colonies. Lord Dartmouth was considered a secret friend of the Americans, although he filled the important position in the British Government of secretary of the colo-

* Yet from Tyerman's statement one important deduction is to be made. Wesley, unlike most Dissenters, preferred an episcopal form of church government. Even after he had read Lord King both Wesley and his Conference declared that the three "orders" were sanctioned, though not enjoined, in the New Testament, and Wesley sent to American Methodism a form for the three ordinations.

nies. Some of the colonists esteemed him so highly as to name one of their colleges Dartmouth, in honor of him.

His lordship was the intimate and patronizing friend of the Wesleys. He was, perhaps, the only nobleman that openly espoused the cause of Methodism. Stevens, in his "History of Methodism," (vol. i, pp. 408–410,) says of him: "At Cheltenham the church was refused them by its rector and wardens; but Lord Dartmouth, *noted as a Methodist*, himself opened his mansion for them. Downing, his chaplain, was a Methodist evangelist, and had done much good in the neighborhood." In his great "field-day" among Whitefield's auditors this great man "stood, with his family, their friend and patron." "Turned away from the Church, the evangelist found shelter at his mansion." As to Lord North, the prime minister of England, we read in Peck's "History of the Republic" (p. 288) that "he was in principle and feeling opposed to the war. *Officially* he favored the king, but *personally* the colonies. This fact was of great moral importance to America." Now Wesley, during this period, was the intimate friend, not only of Dartmouth, but also of North, as the letters to each of them would indicate. Besides this, Tyerman says, (vol. iii, p. 364:) "Wesley was an *ardent friend* of the ministry of Lord North." Thus have we seen that John Wesley had a liberal lineage, that he himself was a practical Dissenter, and an intimate friend and

associate of those known to be at heart in sympathy with the American cause.

Now we will give some attention to the supposed proof of Wesley's disloyalty to the American cause.

We refer, first, to the "Calm Address to the Colonies." It is admitted that this document is unfavorable to the views entertained by the American colonists. In extenuation we may plead that the "Address" was not an original composition of Wesley's, but one he found already in print, and merely revised and adapted to his purpose, as he did many other floating literary productions. What object had he in publishing the document? The title is significant, a *calm* address. He had Societies both in England and America. He was anxious, if possible, to save both from the ravages of a threatened war. We have spoken of his general dread of war because of its moral evil, and of his consequent opposition thereto. He wrote also a "Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England." This was philanthropic and Christian. But it is evident that at that time he did not clearly understand the true cause of complaint on the part of the American colonies. In his reply to those who severely censured him for adopting the opinions of the tract he says: "But what they [the American colonists] contend for is, the illegal privilege of being exempt from parliamentary taxation—a privilege this which no charter ever gave to any American colony yet. . . . Which, in fact, our colonies never had;

which they never claimed till the present reign; and probably they would not have claimed it now had they not been incited thereto by letters from England." —*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 192. He calls this "the *real state* of the question, without any coloring or aggravation." Johnson, the famous author of the tract, had undoubtedly led him into an error. With this explanation no one in America or England can justly find fault with what he wrote. But it is evident that Wesley was disappointed in the exciting effect which this "Address" produced. He says, on the page referred to, "Least of all did I write to inflame any; just the contrary. I contributed my mite toward *putting out the flame* which rages all over the land." In a letter to Thomas Rankin, then in America, dated the same year as the "Calm Address," (1775,) he expresses the same sentiment. He says: "All parties are already too much sharpened against each other; we must pour *water*, not *oil*, into the flame. I had written a little tract ("Calm Address") upon the subject *before I knew the American ports were shut up.* I think there is not one sharp word therein; I did not design there should be." Here he not only gives his motive for printing the "Address," which was certainly good, but also implies a regret that he had published it at all. But in the same letter he deplores its continued circulation. He says: "Indeed it is provoking; I suppose above forty thousand of them have been printed in three weeks, and still the demand for them

is as great as ever." From this it is quite reasonable to suppose that, had he not sold the copyright, as was his custom, particularly respecting his miscellaneous productions, he would have stopped its circulation at once. It is evident, therefore, that this "Address," which is mainly relied on to prove his want of sympathy with the American cause, was, upon more mature reflection, unsatisfactory to Wesley himself, for the two reasons that it did not fairly present the case, and that it did not set forth his former and general sympathy for the American colonies.

But despite all these things the tract in the end had a good effect. Indeed, Wesley says in his "Calm Address to the Inhabitants of England," in 1777, that its effects had exceeded "his most sanguine expectations." This he could say without indorsing what the "Address" contained. We have no doubt the effect was to postpone the war and prolong the fondly entertained hope of Wesley of final and righteous adjustment and reconciliation; for we shall show that such a result was not wholly abandoned by either party for years after. We hold it, then, unfair to rely upon this "Address" as a true and full expression of Wesley's sentiment toward the colonies.

We next refer to Wesley's "Address to the People of England," published in 1777. In this "Address" the error into which Johnson had led Wesley two years before occasionally crops out: that the colonies

asked for liberty or *exemption* from taxation—which of course, was a mistake, since they were willing to return a proper revenue. But the point to which reference is made is embraced in the following paragraph, which we give in its integrity. He says: "Permit me to add a few words to you, a small portion of whom dissent from, but the far greater part remain in, the Church; you who are vulgarly called Methodists. Do any of you blaspheme God or the king? None of you, I trust, who are in connection with me. I would no more continue in fellowship with those who continue in such a practice (blaspheming God and the king) than with Sabbath-breakers, or thieves, or drunkards, or common swearers. But there are not a few who go under that name—though they have no connection with us,* yea, though they cordially hate us as dreadful heretics, for believing that God willeth all men to be saved—who hate the king and all his ministers only less than they do an Arminian, and who speak all manner of evil of them in private, if not in public too."

In this Wesley reproved them sharply for "blaspheming God and the king;" for "hating" the king and all his ministers; for speaking "all manner of evil of them." Does not the Bible forbid these practices in the plainest terms? He was wholly right, then, in what he said. And while the colonial fathers hated the government of the king, they did not

* Calvinistic Methodists.

"blaspheme God and the king;" neither did they speak "all manner of evil" of his ministers. They spoke most emphatically, and yet kindly, of the wrong we suffered by a wrong legislation, and so did Wesley.

No; our fathers did not so speak "of God and the king;" if they had done so they would not have been Christian fathers. Any minister who would fail to reprove such conduct, let him be in Europe or America—in a time of war or in a time of peace--would be derelict in his ministerial duty. No one but an evil surmiser would think of twisting this language of the then venerable Wesley into a repugnance to the American cause.

But we must make one more reference to Wesley's writings. Tyerman says: "In 1778 Wesley, in a pamphlet, traces the American war to its origin, and concludes by foretelling, not the independence of the American colonies—which, he says, would be a heavy curse—but the restoration of civil and Christian liberty."—Vol. iii, p. 280. A very unusual thing for him, yet in this instance Wesley turned prophet. He did not, as the conclusion of the colonial trouble, foretell the independence of the colonies. For a long time after the beginning of the troubles the colonies did not even ask for this. Propositions for reconciliation were made on both sides of the Atlantic, in Parliament and in the Provincial and Continental Congress, from 1774 to 1780. In Peck's "History of

the Great Republic" (p. 257) we read: "Evidently it was no part of the scheme of our fathers to erect an independent government in the western hemisphere. They were subjects of the British crown, and so intended with unaffected loyalty to remain." Independence was finally decided upon as a *last* resort and duty. In 1774 in the American Congress "measures of compromise were defeated by a majority of only a *single vote*."—*Peck*, 284. In the Continental Congress of 1775 a public manifesto, having been adopted by that body, concludes with "imploring" the impartial Judge and Ruler of the universe "to dispose our adversaries to reconciliation upon reasonable terms, and thereby relieve the empire from the calamities of civil war."—*Peck*, p. 252. Here is no intimation of independence, but simply of reconciliation. In the same year, also, Congress declared emphatically: "We have not raised armies with designs of separating from Great Britain and establishing independent States; necessity has not yet driven us into that desperate measure."—*Peck*, p. 256. The same Congress further declared: "North America wishes most ardently for a lasting connection with Great Britain on terms of just and equal liberty; less than which generous minds will not offer, nor brave and free ones receive."—*Peck*, p. 257. It is true, however, that in the following year the colonies, with great unanimity published the immortal Declaration of Independence. While this discouraged many of the

friends of peace, it did not destroy wholly the hope of a just reconciliation. Other nations were solicitous for a restoration of peace. The empress of Russia and the emperor of Germany, at the suggestion of England, were to assist her in her offer and efforts for mediation. Congress, through these offers and the discouragements arising from military defeat, notwithstanding the Declaration of Independence had gone forth, for the time "was induced to waive the demand for a formal acknowledgment of independence."—*Peck*, p. 292. But complications arose, and reconciliation was defeated forever.

Up to this time the British Parliament, too, often rang with the eloquence of those advocating speedy reconciliation, and proposition after proposition was submitted to secure this object. "If Pownal, and Fox, and Burke, could have succeeded in tearing the mask from the eyes of George the Third, . . . could they have made ministers believe what they so confidently affirmed, that they could not conquer America, and that the war, if prolonged, would rob England of the brightest jewel in her crown, the odious Stamp Act would have been promptly repealed, taxation without representation would have been abandoned, and then, so far as we can see, all idea of *independence* would have perished in America."—*Peck*, p. 284. Thus we see that on both sides of the Atlantic all hope of unity and reconciliation

was not given up until 1780. And, indeed, in the British Parliament such a hope was not abandoned until January, 1782, when, by a bare majority of a *few* votes, the House of Commons passed a motion virtually acknowledging the independence of the colonies.

Now let us remember that Wesley was opposed to England making war upon the colonies; that he was opposed to her continuing the war, and all the while anxious for the cessation of hostilities. In view of the fact above noticed, that there was no widespread desire or apprehension of the independence of the colonies, on the part of either of the contending parties—at least, not up to 1780—it was surely not reprehensible on the part of Wesley in 1777 not to foretell the independence of the American colonies. It was nothing more than an error, simply for the lack of the gift of prophecy, for him to suppose that such an event would be a curse—whether to England or America he does not say. But what did he foretell? In the next item he was not mistaken. He foretold "a restoration of civil and Christian liberty" to the colonies.

This was what he had contended for from the very beginning of the unhappy conflict. Had these been granted independence would not have followed, at least not at that time, since for a long time after it was not even asked for. It was the good part of a true friend of the colonies to foretell the restoration to

them of their civil and Christian liberties, of which they had justly complained so much and so long that they had been deprived. Surely Burke and Fox and Pownal, who eloquently pleaded for what Wesley foretold would come, were the friends and not the enemies of the colonies. If they were the friends of the colonies, so was Wesley. If they were not the enemies of the colonies in so doing, neither was Wesley. This places Wesley in the company of the warmest and truest sympathizing friends of America. And this is where history leaves him.

CHAPTER II.

Asbury's Adoption of the American Cause and Country.

AT the Annual Conference of Wesley's preachers, in 1771, in answer to Wesley's statement, "Our brethren in America call aloud for help: who are willing to go over and help them?" Francis Asbury, Richard Wright, and three others volunteered, two of whom, Asbury and Wright, were accepted and sent. Asbury was then a young man, in his twenty-sixth year, and had already been five years a traveling preacher. This evidently required moral courage in the young missionary, as already hostilities were threatening between the colonies and the mother country. In 1760 the Lords of Trade advised the taxation of the colonies, and taxation without representation was the highest note in the battle-cry of the Revolution. In 1761 James Otis, in the city of Boston, made his open and eloquent appeal in favor of the rights of the people. The following year the whole continent was shaken with the royal interference with the colonial judiciary. In 1766 the agitation was so intense that the colonies compelled the repeal of the Stamp Act. In 1767 the famous "Farmer's Letters," by John Dickinson, were published as a protest against a new act of taxation. In 1769

the Legislature of Massachusetts "planned resistance" to England, and Samuel Adams favored an appeal to Heaven for support. The same year the British authorities sent naval and military forces to Boston.

A foreign missionary often receives contempt enough from the fact that he is a foreigner; but when the two countries—the one in which he had his birth, and the one in which he is laboring—are unfriendly, he may expect to receive even more marked expressions of dislike, perhaps of abuse. Yet with all the perils of a slow voyage at sea, with perhaps greater prospective perils when he should land, with apostolic zeal Asbury braved the dangers, and commenced what ultimately proved to be one of the most useful religious lives ever spent on the American continent. After a voyage of more than fifty days he landed in Philadelphia, the very city from which, in about four years thereafter, issued the famous Declaration of Independence. Asbury found the other missionaries disposed to settle in the cities: he was an itinerant. He labored ardently, both by example and precept, to establish a plan of itinerancy. He said, "I have not yet the thing I seek: a circulation of preachers. I am fixed to the Methodist plan; I am willing to suffer, yea, to die, sooner than betray so good a cause by any means." And as an itinerant he traversed the length and breadth of the colonies during the stormy period of the Revolution, (excepting a few months,)

without let or hinderance, planting and training the religious life.

But we have to prove his loyalty. We will first give the testimony of two eminent men who were intimate personal acquaintances of Bishop Asbury. The first is Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, whom Tyerman says the Americans call their Lycurgus because of his profound wisdom, and who was, according to this author, "a diligent student and a close observer of men and things." Cooper says of Asbury that he was "a safe and a good citizen, a circumspect Christian, and a faithful minister of the Gospel, worthy of confidence as a friend to the country of his choice, of which he had voluntarily become a citizen."—*American Methodism*, p. 120. The other witness is Rev. Nicholas Snethen. He knew Asbury intimately. He says: "Mr. Asbury was the only English preacher that adopted the American country, and he was determined to stand or fall with the cause of independence."—*Reply to F. O'Kelly*, p. 18. These of themselves furnish sufficient testimony to refute even a suspicion of disloyalty to the American cause.

Again: Larrabee says, in his "Asbury and his Colaborers," p. 35, that Asbury "frankly told Mr. Rankin that he felt quite sure the Americans would never be satisfied with any thing short of independence; and that he felt a presentiment that God Almighty designed America to be free and independent, and that a great American Methodist people would be

gathered in the country. Some time before, Mr. Asbury had checked Mr. Rankin in an abusive tirade in conference against the spirit and designs of the Americans. From these facts Mr. Rankin considered Mr. Asbury as leaning strongly toward the rebels." "From this we see," observes the same author, (p. 36,) "that he was at heart friendly to the cause of the colonies, and ready to renounce allegiance to the British crown, and to become in fact what he already was in spirit, an American citizen." This rebuke was doubtless given in the conference of 1775, as Mr. Rankin returned to England in 1777.

Thus we see that almost from the commencement of the colonial difficulty Asbury had not only a presentiment of American independence, but was truly in sympathy with the American cause, and was so considered at the time. And he continued to maintain these sentiments, for in 1777 he wrote a letter to Mr. Rankin "in which he gave it as his opinion that the Americans would become a free and independent nation; that he was too much knit in affection to many of them to leave them."—STEVENS, *History M. E. Church*, vol. i, p. 312. From these extracts it is seen that Asbury's political and religious foresight were in advance of many of the wisest and best of his day, not excepting Wesley himself. We may add this quotation from the same volume, (p. 235:) "Asbury, bound as an Englishman to be respectful to his Government, evidently saw, with the American

statesmen, the great probable issues of the contest both to the Church and the State. His sagacious mind anticipated the triumph which awaited Methodism in the regenerated country. Though he apprehended immediate evil effects from the Revolution, he was reticent, yet obviously hopeful, and, as he subsequently proved, loyal at heart to the colonial cause." We believe that it will appear evident to the reader from the above testimony, collected impartially from various historical records covering the war period, and which could be very greatly augmented, that the loyalty of Bishop Asbury to the American cause can be clearly established.

But we will make one or two more references. The first is to M'Clintock and Strong's "Cyclopædia," article Asbury: "When the war broke out Rankin returned to England; but Asbury, foreseeing the great work of the Church in America, remained. He thought it would be an eternal disgrace to forsake in this time of trial the thousands of poor sheep in the wilderness who had placed themselves under the care of the Methodists, and, fully sympathizing with the cause of the struggling colonies, he resolved to remain and share the sufferings and the fate of the infant connection and of the country. Like many religious people of those times, he was, from conscientious scruples, a non-juror, as were all the other Methodist preachers, and also many of the clergy of the Episcopal Church, who yet chose to remain in the

country. As their character and motives were not understood, they were exposed to much suffering and persecution. . . . The authorities becoming convinced that there was no treason in the Methodist preachers, but that their scruples were of a religious, not of a political, nature, and that they were merely intent upon preaching the Gospel of peace as humble evangelists, they were permitted to exercise their functions unmolested." And when the struggle was over, and the news of peace was received, Asbury, in preaching on the occasion, took these words as his text: "The word which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ: he is Lord of all." Who is competent to calculate the value of such a life in the foundation, the preservation, and the development of a great Church and a mighty republic? The combined effects of his holy life, his Gospel preaching, his itinerant method in implanting and sustaining the religious life of the nation, who can estimate?

CHAPTER III.

Loyalty of the Native Ministry and Membership.

WHEN the Declaration of American Independence was signed, which was in reality the American declaration of war, by reference to the Conference Minutes it may be seen that about two thirds of the Methodist preachers in the country were native Americans. The one third were mostly simply missionaries sent to America by Wesley and the Wesleyan Conference. This was neither their native nor intended home. It was but natural they should desire to return to their native land when they beheld the storm-cloud of war arising; but fearing the ravages of the war, and dreading the compulsion of the authorities, they considered their path to success largely hedged up; hence they returned to their native country. Their conduct was natural and correct.

Wesley's known opposition to war, which we have before shown, had doubtless had much to do with the refusal of his missionaries to take the test-oath. But besides this, at the very beginning of hostilities he reminded his missionaries in America of their sole duty, to preach the Gospel, and not to meddle with politics—to be non-partisans. In 1775 he wrote a letter to Thomas Rankin, then his general assistant,

or superintendent, in America, at the close of which he says: "I add a line to all the preachers: My dear brethren, you were never in your lives in so critical a situation as you are at this time. It is your part to be peace-makers; to be loving and tender to all; but to addict yourselves to no party. In spite of all solicitations of rough or smooth words, say not one word against one or the other side. Keep yourselves pure; do all you can to help and soften all; but beware how you adopt another jar." This letter shows that Wesley fully comprehended their precarious situation. He clearly foresaw their perplexities, trials, and sufferings. His advice was not only seasonable, but sensible, although Rankin and Rodda failed to be governed by it in one instance each. Under the same date Charles Wesley wrote to Rankin giving similar advice in these words: "My dear brother, as to public affairs I wish you to be likeminded with me. I am of neither side, and yet of both; on the side of New England and of Old. Private Christians are excused, exempted, privileged to take no part in civil troubles. We love all and pray for all with a sincere and impartial love. Faults there may be on both sides, but such as neither you nor I can remedy; therefore, let us and all our children give ourselves unto prayer, and so stand still and see the salvation of God."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 194. Now if Wesley had been a lover of war and a despotic monarchist, and wholly on the side of England, and if all the Meth-

odists in Europe and America entertained like opinions, he would have rather urged the American Methodists, preachers and all, as soon as the British troops stepped on American soil, to enlist under their flag and aid in dispersing these rebels. To have been consistent with the opposite opinion he should have done so. But he took a wiser and more Christian course. And doubtless these letters were read to the American preachers and members, and as they greatly venerated Wesley, they would generally and rigidly follow his advice; and no "solicitations, rough or smooth," could make them swerve from this timely counsel. And following this, they could not take the test-oath. It was, therefore, not from a principle of disloyalty, but from conscientious scruples and a respect for the opinions and advice of Wesley, that these persons were non-jurors.

Besides the influence of Wesley's opinion and advice, many of the American preachers and members were, from religious and Christian principles, opposed to taking up arms. And it is due to their fragrant memories that this fact be duly stated. That such was the fact, however, is susceptible of clearest proof from historical records. Of Asbury it is particularly said: "He was required to take the test-oath of Maryland, and swear that he would be ready to bear arms in the patriot cause at the call of the authorities. He was a non-combatant, and could not conscientiously do it; and he looked about for a place of

safety till the war-cloud should be passed."—SCUDDER'S *American Methodism*, p. 205. As it respects the preachers and people Bangs tells us that they "were from principle averse to war, for such was the case in respect to most of the preachers and people denominated Methodists."—BANGS'S *History*, vol. i, p. 139. A contemporary historian confirms this statement when he says: "Some [of the Methodists] were bound in their consciences not to fight, and no threatenings could compel them to bear arms or hire substitutes."

Thus Asbury was not singular in his opposition to war: many of the American preachers, of whose fidelity to their country there could be no question, shared his opinions. We first refer to Benjamin Abbott, of whom the best historian of Methodism says, he was "in many respects the most remarkable evangelist in the eventful field. He dressed with Quaker-like simplicity, and his broad-brimmed hat and straight coat added not a little to the attraction of his devout temper among the numerous Friends of New Jersey. They liked him the more for his Quaker doctrine about war, then raging in the land. He was *a sound patriot*, but could not approve fighting, though in early life a formidable pugilist."—STEVENS'S *M. E. Church*, vol. i, p. 386. On pages 407 and 408 of the same volume we find an account of one of the most popular preachers of that day, and one who became the first American Methodist historian, Jesse Lee: "His

conscience revolted from war. 'I weighed the matter over and over again,' he says, 'but my mind was settled; as a Christian and as a preacher of the Gospel I could not fight. I could not reconcile it to myself to bear arms or to kill one of my fellow-creatures.'" But he was drafted and compelled to go into camp. He was ordered on parade. A gun was offered him, but he refused to take it. One was set down against him, but he refused to touch it. He was placed under guard. He sang and prayed and preached until the officers and men were bathed in tears. The colonel took him out to talk with him "about bearing arms. I told him," he says, "I could not kill a man with good conscience, but I was a friend to my country, and was willing to do any thing I could while I continued in the army except that of fighting." He was detained in the army about four months in a subordinate relation, and then was released. From these leading examples we find another cause why those early preachers refused to take the test-oath, why they were non-jurors; not from disloyal feelings toward the American cause, but from religious convictions. And in this principle, it is to be noted, there was a similarity between those early Methodists and the Quakers and Moravians, who were likewise non-jurors. Methodism had, to a large extent, copied their costume, spirit, and language. And as it certainly was not in the one case so it was not in the other, that episcopacy, high or low-church, had

any thing to do with their position during the war. They were, with few exceptions, in heart the truest friends of the American cause.

We must now refer to the arrest and fine of Asbury and others. It certainly cannot be proved that they were arrested and fined because of any overt act or outspoken word of treason, but simply because they refused to take the test-oaths and to bear arms. Concerning Mr. Asbury it may be further said: "The test-oaths required a pledge to take up arms if called upon to do so by the authorities. Asbury, though well-affected toward the colonial cause, could not consent to such a contingency. His conscience as a preacher of the Gospel forbade him."—*American Methodism*, p. 119. Because of this, and not from any disloyal act or word, he was, notwithstanding his great prudence, arrested and fined, as were some others. But did the authorities ever prove any thing treasonable or unchristian against them? Says an eminent writer (Ezekiel Cooper) who was cognizant of many of the persons and facts, and who is said to have been "a close observer of men and things:" "They were never able to substantiate any allegation, or the appearance of a charge, against him that was incompatible with the character of a citizen, a Christian, or a faithful minister of the Gospel."—STEVENS'S *M. E. Church*, vol. i, p. 279. This testimony is of itself sufficient to settle the question of Asbury's loyalty to the colonies. But we have much additional

evidence. The authorities soon became convinced of the sympathy of the Methodists with the American cause, and that there was nothing disloyal in them. In Drew's "Life of Coke," p. 66, we read: "Satisfied, however, that the preachers who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the State were not actuated by any principle of hostility to the cause of America, their case was shortly afterward taken into serious consideration by the Assembly of Maryland," which passed a law exempting them from the test-oath. We will add one more authority as to whether their arrest and fine and imprisonment are proof of their disloyalty. It is M'Clintock and Strong's "Cyclopædia," vol. i, p. 452, which says: "The authorities becoming convinced that there was no treason in the Methodist preachers, but that their scruples were of a religious, not of a political, nature, and that they were merely intent upon preaching the Gospel of peace as humble evangelists, they were permitted to exercise their functions unmolested." And, as the same authority says, because their character and motives had not been understood, they had been exposed to much suffering and persecution.

But here we must refer to the attempts to arrest Judge White, of Delaware, on a suspicion that he, too, was opposed to the action of the Americans and favorable to the crown. At one time the mob surrounded his residence, intending to arrest him. At that time there was stopping with him an officer in

the colonial army named Bassett. "Bassett was a militia officer, and with drawn sword guarded the door of the mansion, thus preventing the entrance of the mob. 'He is no more a Tory than you are,' he shouted; 'you shall have him only by passing over my dead body.'"—STEVENS'S *M. E. Church*, vol. i, p. 317. No one could know better the political character of Judge White than this intimate friend and military officer. These things show the kind of company Asbury kept during the Revolutionary war. White was Chief Judge of the Common Pleas, of whom it is said, "In moral worth he had no superior in his day." Through Asbury's influence, doubtless, he and his wife became Methodists, and both lived in the enjoyment of perfect love. Asbury says of him, "He was among my very best friends." As to the military officer, Bassett, he and Asbury were intimate friends, and the latter often found in his house a generous home. He and his wife lived bright examples of holiness after becoming Methodists, and "left the world praising God." Colonel Bassett was afterward a delegate to the convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, a Senator in Congress, and Governor of his State. Among many other influential friends of Asbury and the other preachers during the Revolution we may finally mention the illustrious name of "pious Judge Barrett." He and they had not only been intimate friends, but he used his personal and legal influence to silence the sense-

less cry of Toryism against them. Thus we find that Asbury and the other preachers during the Revolution ranked among their warmest friends some of the best friends of the American cause.

Another item that possibly needs an explanation is a letter of Wesley's, written in 1777, in which he says he had received two letters from New York informing him that "all the Methodists there are firm for the Government, and on that account are hated and persecuted by the rebels." But what were the facts in this case? The British, by a victorious battle fought on Long Island, August 27, 1776, obtained possession of New York city. According to Bangs, (vol. i, p. 119,) the American Conference sent no preacher to New York from 1776 till 1783, the year of the treaty of peace. If all the American preachers were Tories, or firm for the English Government, or even some of them, New York was certainly then a suitable appointment for them; and more so if all the Society there were like-minded. But no regular preacher could be found for the appointment. And this very fact is clearest proof of the loyalty of the American preachers to the colonial cause. Let it not be supposed that the reason why no preacher was sent to New York while it was in possession of the British troops was because the Church was occupied by the troops as barracks, or for a hospital, for Wakeley has shown that it was not so occupied. It was open for religious services. Besides this, we have

the proof that not all of the Society at New York, even, were "firm for the English Government," as the letter to Wesley indicates. Stevens says, (vol. i, p. 420:) "If some of its communicants were royalists at the arrival of the foreign troops, yet, by frequent removals to Nova Scotia and elsewhere, they left a decided majority who were loyal to the colonial cause." Now, as proof that the above statement is correct, Wakeley mentions how repeatedly this Society was treated with disrespect, their religious services disgracefully interrupted, and the house pelted with stones by the British troops and officers. This would not have been done if all that Society had been "firm for the English Government." We are prepared, therefore, to set down that letter to Wesley, which at most only applies to the Methodists of New York, as incorrect. Wesley did not say, either, that he believed it true. He simply states that he had received a letter containing such declaration. And while it may be admitted as highly probable—which Wakeley, indeed, asserts—that the John-street pulpit was more or less regularly supplied during the possession of that city by the British troops, yet it must not be forgotten that it was not so supplied by the native American preachers appointed by the American Conference. It might be said that the reason was because they could not pass the British lines. But there could have been no difficulty in this matter if it was then so generally known that all the

Methodists, preachers and people, were in sympathy with King George III., and if their prayers and hearts were all against Washington and the American army.

But we have eminent English testimony that the American preachers were not "firm for the Government"—that they did not take that side of the unhappy controversy.

In closing this part of our subject we give a little circumstantial and collateral evidence of the loyalty of the Methodists to the colonial cause.

America was the birthplace of most of them. As is natural, men are generally attached to the place of their birth. Any thing said or done against it is naturally repelled. They may not arise in martial array, yet their feelings resist any unfavorable word or act. Hence the native American Methodists were loyal to the home and country of their birth. This conclusion is natural.

Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, one of the earlier preachers, was a son of a Revolutionary officer. During the war Freeborn Garrettson was at one time at his father's residence, standing in the center of a hollow square of soldiers, preaching to them, when Cooper first came under his notice. Evidently these soldiers did not think Garrettson hostile to the American cause. It is fair to presume that Cooper, with this parentage and amid such associations, became a stanch patriot. And there is no indication to the contrary.

The Rev. Thomas Ware, another early preacher, speaking of himself at the age of sixteen, says: "Young and ardent, all my feelings were on the side of America. I was delighted, therefore, to hear the bold and unfaltering voice of the undaunted Henry raised in defiance of the sovereign who was endeavoring to crush us."—*Life of Ware*, p. 25. He became a Methodist during the war, and as a Methodist preacher was present at the General Conference of 1784, when the Church was organized. His is but another instance of the adherence to the American cause of those early Methodists. Ware also cites the case of a preacher of his acquaintance. It is that of the Rev. Richard Ivy. He says of him, (p. 72,) "Ivy, in a sermon preached in the presence of officers and soldiers, spoke fluently and forcibly in commendation of the cause of freedom from foreign and domestic tyranny; and to the officers he said, 'Sirs, I would fain show you my heart;' (here baring his bosom,) 'if it beats not high for legitimate liberty, may it forever cease to beat!' The officers wished him well, and declared that they were willing to share with him their last shilling." The truth is, the native ministry and membership were loyal to the American cause, although but few of them took up arms in the dreadful conflict. They felt themselves specially called to a spiritual warfare.

We now notice the relation these early Methodists in America sustained to the Episcopal Church in England. The question might properly be asked, Were

they not yet considered members of the Church of England, whose ritual enjoined loyalty to George III.? In theory and practice and name they were more Dissenters than Episcopalians. Their proper religious title was Methodists, while only in an awkward and remote sense could they be styled Episcopalians. They prayed their own prayers, preached their own sermons, sung their own hymns, proclaimed their own doctrines, and obeyed their own Discipline and Rules.

In the first Annual Conference in America, held in Philadelphia, 1773, they adopted the following as rules of government: "Ought not the authority of Mr. Wesley to extend to the preachers and people in America as well as in Great Britain and Ireland? Yes. Ought not the doctrines and discipline of the Methodists, *as contained in their Minutes*, to be the sole rule of our conduct who labor in the Connection with Mr. Wesley in America? Yes. If so, does it not follow that if any preachers deviate from the Minutes we can have no fellowship with them till they change their conduct? Yes." The Minutes of their Conference, and not the ritual of the Church of England, was the rule of their ecclesiastical conduct, and these did not either expressly or impliedly enjoin exclusive obedience to George III. But proper obedience to all in civil authority they could and did render.

CHAPTER IV.

The Constitution of the Church Loyal.

THE third American Annual Conference was held in Philadelphia, May 17, 1775. Mr. Asbury says of it, that it was conducted "with great harmony and sweetness of temper." This was at one of the centers of the colonial agitation, and more than a year before the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Negotiations for peace were still being discussed. Fearing the desolation of war, and hoping for an amicable adjustment of all differences, and in any event praying for success in their apostolic mission, the conference orders "a general fast for the prosperity of the work and for the peace of America," to be held the 18th of July following. They here blend the civil and religious interests of the country; and, so far as known, this is the first official reference by the American Methodists to national prosperity.

In the latter part of 1784 John Wesley prepared and had printed in England a liturgy entitled, "The Sunday Service of the Methodists in North America, with other Occasional Services," in which was a prayer for "the supreme rulers of the United States." This, it will be seen, was about one year after the definitive treaty of peace was signed, (1783,) about

four years before the Constitution was ratified by Congress, (1788,) and five years before Washington was inaugurated President of the United States in 1789. Thus early the Church officially commenced authorized prayers for the infant Republic, and that at the suggestion of John Wesley, a British subject. But, perhaps not considering himself sufficiently informed, Wesley did not draw up an Article of Religion relating to the subject, leaving that to the wisdom of the American Conference. Hence, at the Christmas Conference, as it is called, which convened in the city of Baltimore on that day, in 1784, it adopted the following article, entitled, "Of the Rulers of the United States of America:" "The Congress, the General Assemblies, the Governors, and the Councils of State, as the delegates of the people, are the rulers of the United States of America, according to the division of power made to them by the general Act of Confederation, and by the Constitutions of their respective States. And the said States ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction."

This is believed to be the first ecclesiastical recognition of the new Republic. But as the "Service" containing the other Articles of Religion had been printed in England, it was thought proper to print this article in connection with the Minutes. Hence it was deferred, and did not appear in the American "Sunday Service" until 1786, when it was published as the Twenty-third Article. It must have been of

great value to the Republic in unifying its discordant elements, and strengthening its spirit of independence, to hear a religious body, composed of eighty-four preachers, with such distinguished men as Coke and Asbury at their head, and representing about fifteen thousand members scattered throughout the States, declare itself as emphatically and patriotically in favor of the independent nation.

The Act of Confederation was drawn up by Dickinson in 1776, but it took five years for all the States to agree to sign it. Maryland, the last to yield, signed it in 1781, thus making it the organic law of the nation. Many of the States soon became dissatisfied with it. Agitation lasted for six years, when, in 1788, the Constitution of the United States took the place of the Act of Confederation.

The famous resolutions passed by Kentucky in 1798, and by Virginia in 1799, formed the basis of the State Rights party. And to show where the Methodist Church stood during those times on this most important question, the sagacious Cooper, in the General Conference of 1804, offered an amendment to Article XXIII, which was adopted. It inserted the word President before the word Congress, recognizing him as the chief ruler of the nation. It substituted "the Constitution of the United States" for the "Act of Confederation." This was in harmony with, and in support of, what the Congress had done in 1788. The amendment also repudiated the idea that the States

are simply a confederacy, by inserting after the word States these words, "are a sovereign and independent nation." Thus, in the language of the Church's historian, Stevens, after the adoption of the national Constitution, the Methodist Episcopal Church "never doubted the sovereign nationality of the Republic, and never had the unstatesmanlike folly to recognize any State right of secession, or any sovereignty which is not subordinate to the national sovereignty." Thus it is seen that at every progressive step in the erection of the temple of this Republic the Methodist Episcopal Church has been ready to step forward promptly and support and strengthen its mighty pillars.

But it will be further seen that as of the nation so of the Church, its constitution grows and is not made. So far as progress within the United States is concerned its law of loyalty was perfect. But its field is the world. In 1819 the Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized. In 1820 the Canada Conference was organized. Now the question arose, How shall the ministry and people conduct themselves under foreign governments? The General Conference of 1820 appended this note to the article referred to: "As far as it respects civil affairs, we believe it the duty of Christians, and especially all Christian ministers, to be subject to the supreme authority of the country where they may reside, and to use all laudable means to enjoin obedience to the

powers that be; and therefore it is expected that all our preachers and people who may be under the British or any other Government will behave themselves as peaceable and orderly subjects." And here it should be added that these requirements are well-nigh complete and wholly scriptural.

It will be observed that on this subject, too, the Methodist Episcopal Church occupies safe ground. It is also grandly helping to universalize the sentiment that all international troubles should be adjusted by an appeal to the godly intelligence of men, and not to the bloody arbitrament of the sword. And why should not this sentiment be inculcated and applied to internal States and Provinces as well? Especially so when we know that war settles nothing but the question of superior military skill and power, and not always these. If people would but obey the principles of the Gospel there would not be any unjust aggressions on the one hand, nor unrighteous rebellions on the other. They would adjust their differences by the mutual light of intelligence and justice, as they must at last do. And if all Christian Churches in all localities, in all nations, would combine heartily to infuse and spread this Gospel sentiment, it would not be very long until the sublime vision of the prophet would be realized, when the swords should be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning-hooks. But we have to take the world as it now is. We must act wisely and prudently. Hence the Method-

ist Episcopal law enjoins, like the Scriptures, a general obedience to powers and governments. It leaves the individual free to assume the responsibility of individual or particular exceptions, arising from conscience or the peculiarities of the special case. This is consonant with personal freedom. Hence the constitutional law secures general loyalty on the one hand, and allows proper individual freedom on the other. Bishop Asbury and Dr. Coke, in their notes on the Discipline in 1796, said: "We are debtors to the Constitution under which we live (especially in the United States) for all the blessings of law and liberty which we enjoy, and without government to support that Constitution all would be anarchy and confusion. It is, therefore, our duty to support it by bearing with our fellow-citizens an equal proportion of its expenses; and it is as great a crime to rob our country as to rob a private individual, and the blindness of too many to this truth injures not in the least the veracity of it." Now, although this item is here given a little out of time in relation to the other facts before given, yet it is certainly in time as it respects the current facts of this day.

EMINENT WITNESSES.

In May, 1789, the Conference was in session in the city of New York. General Washington had just been elected president, and was then in the city. The Methodist Episcopal Church, always forward in expressing its love of civil and religious liberty, and giving its promises of support to our free insti-

tutions, was the first religious body to wait upon Washington and tender him their congratulations for his eminent services in conquering a peace and for his election to the presidency of the new Republic. Is their language the language of Tories? Did they consider a republican form of government the opposite of their government of the Church? Let us see. "We, the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, humbly beg leave, in the name of our Society, collectively, in these United States, to express to you the warm feelings of our hearts, and our sincere congratulations on your appointment to the presidentship of these States. We are conscious, from the signal proofs you have already given, that you are a friend of mankind, and under this established idea place as full confidence in your wisdom and integrity for the preservation of those civil and religious liberties which have been transmitted to us by the providence of God and the glorious Revolution as we believe ought to be reposed in man." And for this "we promise you our fervent prayers at the throne of grace." In reply, Washington said, "I return to you individually," (Coke and Asbury,) "you who have been my ardent friends and earnest supporters, and through you to your Society, collectively, in the United States," (he did not think they had all been Tories during the Revolution,) "my thanks for the demonstration of affection and the expressions of joy offered in behalf of my late appointment." And knowing that they had practiced as they now talked, and were in harmony with himself, he says: "It always affords me satisfaction when I find a concurrence of sentiment and practice between all conscientious men in acknowledgments of homage to the great Governor of the universe, and in professions of support to a just civil government." After saying that he trusted that all religious people would repose the same confidence in him, he says: "But I must assure you in particular that I take in the kindest part the promise you make of presenting your prayers at the throne of grace for me, and that I likewise implore the divine benediction on yourselves and your religious community."

The Methodist Episcopal Church was thus officially recog-

nized as the true friend of the infant Republic. The Church and the Republic were twin sisters, born in the tempest and rocked together in the cradle of the Revolution. They have lived and grown up, the handmaids of each other, and both, to a large extent, the wonders and the models of the world. At the outbreak of the recent rebellion, after the attack on Fort Sumter, the Methodist Episcopal Church was the first religious body (the New York East Conference) to pledge its loyal co-operation with the Government; and, by a happy coincidence, it was also the first religious body (the same conference) to telegraph congratulations to the Government at the downfall of the rebellion by the surrender of Lee. Thus was the Methodist Episcopal Church the *first* to recognize the new Republic, the *first* to promise it prayers and fidelity, the *first* to pledge assistance to suppress the Rebellion, the *first* to telegraph to it rejoicings at the triumphs of civil and religious liberty.

During the late war its entire denominational press without one single exception, equal to, if not more extensive and able than, any in the land, was the fervent and continued friend of liberty and republicanism. And the military columns in the defense of freedom and the Constitution were largely filled up from its pulpits and pews. And it has been estimated that she gave in support of our free institutions not less than *three hundred thousand men*. And thousands of her members now sleep, uncoffined and unknown, in martyrs' graves. And, speaking of the services of the Church in the country, says Bancroft, the historian of the Republic: "America has welcomed the members of Wesley's Society as the pioneers of religion, and the breath of liberty has wafted their message to the masses of the people, encouraged them to collect the white and negro, slave and master, in the greenwood for counsel on Divine love, and the full assurance of grace, and carried their consolation and songs and prayers to the farthest cabin in the wilderness."

Says Dr. Baird, a member of another denomination, one who well understands the relative merits of the different denominations of this nation, and who was chosen to represent the American Churches at the Evangelical Alliance in

Europe, held at Geneva in 1860: "We recognize in the Methodist economy, as well as in the zeal, the devoted piety, and the efficiency of its ministry, one of the most powerful elements in the religious prosperity of the United States, as well as one of the firmest pillars of their civil and political institutions." But there is scarcely any end to the voluntary testimony that is given in favor of the invaluable support which the Methodist Episcopal Church renders to the free institutions of this nation. But we will produce only one more witness; one whose honesty, wisdom, and sagacity as a statesman has been unequaled, at least since the days of Washington. Said President Lincoln: "Nobly sustained as the Government has been by all the Churches, I would utter nothing which might in the least appear invidious against any. Yet without this it may fairly be said that the Methodist Episcopal Church, not less devoted than the best, is, by its greater numbers, the most important of all. It is no fault in others that the Methodist Church sends more soldiers to the field, more nurses to the hospitals, and more prayers to heaven than any. God bless the Methodist Church! bless all the Churches! And blessed be God, who in this our great trial giveth us the Churches!" Thus this wise and good man, in supporting his strenuous efforts to save and perpetuate our free institutions, our civil and religious liberties, recognized the Methodist Episcopal Church as the most important of them all. Thus we have seen that the leading historian, the theologians and statesmen from Washington to Grant, whose wife is a member of this Church, and he himself holding an official position on one of the Church boards, have regarded the Methodist Episcopal Church, in its economy as well as its membership, the most important of them all; one of the firmest pillars of our civil and political institutions.

CHAPTER V.

PROTESTS AGAINST NATIONAL EVILS.

The Slavery Question.

JOHN WESLEY'S opposition to slavery, and especially to American slavery, was constant and pronounced; to us, therefore, it appears strange that George Whitefield, his colaborer, should advocate and practice the system. Yet he did. In 1751 he wrote: "As to the lawfulness of keeping slaves I have no doubt. What a flourishing country might Georgia have been had the use of them been permitted years ago! I should think myself highly favored if I could purchase a good number of them, in order to make their lives comfortable, and lay a foundation for breeding up their posterity in the nurture and admonition of the Lord." Twenty years after this he died, owning seventy-five slaves in connection with his Orphan House plantation in Georgia. (*Tyerman*, vol. ii, p. 132.) Whitefield seems, however, to have opposed the importation of slaves, but thought it proper to own them with a view to their religious culture. This theory was once advocated by many good people. But John Wesley denounced the whole system in most unsparing terms. If he did less than

Wilberforce in securing legislation favorable to the manumission of slaves, he was no less emphatic in his condemnation of the great evil. In 1772 he says he read "a book published by an honest Quaker on that execrable sum of all villainies, commonly called the slave-trade. I read of nothing like it in the heathen world, whether ancient or modern, and it infinitely excels in every instance of barbarity whatever Christian slaves suffer in Mohammedan countries."—*Works*, vol. iv, p. 366.

It was this Quaker document that first called the British mind to this inhuman traffic. And it was during this very year that Granville Sharpe commenced the agitation of the subject. Wesley's recorded denunciation of this wrong preceded by fifteen years, the organization of the "Society for the Suppression of the Slave-Trade" by Sharpe, Clarkson, and Wilberforce, as it did the abolition of slavery in the provinces of Great Britain by sixty years, and its overthrow in America more than by ninety years. Wesley's "Thoughts on American Slavery" was published in 1774, and its utterances against this evil are sufficiently well known without repetition here. It is remarkable that the last letter of his life was written against this monster vice. In 1791 Wilberforce had already brought a resolution before Parliament for the abolition of slavery in the West Indies, for which he was much persecuted. To encourage him Wesley wrote: "Go on in the name of

God, and in the power of his might, till even American slavery (the vilest that ever saw the sun) shall vanish away before it." He said, further, that during that morning he had been reading a tract in which it was said that it was the law in the colonies "that the *oath* of a black against a white goes for nothing. What villainy is this!"—*Life of Wilberforce*, vol. i, p. 297. What a noble life-record is this against that system of human oppression and in favor of human liberty! Let the American sons of Wesley remember his almost dying testimony in favor of universal freedom.

Dr. Coke, too, Wesley's representative in America, also bore similar testimony. In 1795, four years after the death of Wesley, he writes: "I do long for the time when the Lord will turn their captivity [that of the slaves] like the rivers of the South. And he will appear for them. He is winding up the sacred ball; he is sweeping off the wicked with the besom of destruction, with pestilence, famine, and war, and will never withdraw his hand till civil and religious liberty be established over all the earth. I have no doubt but if the body of Methodist preachers keep close to God they will be the chief instruments of bringing about this most desirable state of things."—STEVENS'S *M. E. Church*, vol. iii, p. 354. What a prophecy is in this! How accurately has it been fulfilled!

In his love of universal freedom Asbury was as

ardent as Coke. In 1795 he writes from South Carolina: "My spirit was grieved at the conduct of some Methodists that hire out slaves at public places to the highest bidder, to cut, skin, and starve them. I think such members ought to be dealt with. I will try if words can be like drawn swords to pierce the hearts of the owners." And again he says that his mind was much pained because some "Methodists, Baptists, and Presbyterians in the highest flights of rapturous piety still maintain and defend it." Again he writes, "If the Gospel will tolerate slavery what will it not authorize?"

Thus Coke and Asbury wrote and spoke against this national evil, and suffered much persecution because thereof.

Led on by such philanthropic men, the American preachers, as might be expected, soon took decided ground against slavery and in favor of human freedom. In the Conference of 1780 they declared "that slavery is contrary to the laws of God, man, and nature, and hurtful to society; contrary to the dictates of conscience and pure religion, and doing that which we would not that others should do to us and ours; and we pass our disapprobation on all our friends who keep slaves, and advise their freedom." "Methodism thus early recorded its protest against negro slavery, anticipating its abolition in Massachusetts by three years, in Rhode Island and Connecticut by four years; the thesis of Clarkson, before the University of

Cambridge, by five years; and the ordinance of Congress against it, in the North-western Territory, by seven years."—STEVENS'S *M. E. Church*, vol. ii, p. 78. In 1789 the Conference, by inserting the following among the General Rules, forbade "the buying or selling the bodies and souls of men, women, or children with an intention to enslave them."

To follow this history much further is unnecessary, especially since slavery is gone, we believe, to return no more. It is enough to say that the slave power, both in Church and State, for a time waxed stronger and stronger. It sought to control both, and to sit in the chief seats of power and authority. The Church always regarded slavery as an evil, and it was ever seeking methods for its extirpation. And rather than that it should dominate the highest function of the Church it suffered a large dismemberment. Its protests against the evil have been varied but certain.

The Temperance Question.

The Church has always been the friend of temperance and the foe of intemperance. And upon this national evil—yes, this universal evil—it has ever looked with a significant frown. Strict temperance has been its unvarying theory, if not its uniform practice.

John Wesley's position on the temperance question now claims our attention. Of the source and fountain of intemperance he wrote, in 1760, in his sermon

on the "Use of Money:" "Neither may we gain by hurting our neighbor in his body. Therefore we may not sell any thing which tends to impair health. Such is eminently all that *liquid fire* commonly called drams or spirituous liquors. It is true, these may have a place in medicine; they may be of use in some bodily disorders; although there would rarely be occasion for them were it not for the unskillfulness of the practitioner. Therefore such as prepare and sell them only for this end may keep their conscience clear. But all who sell them in the common way, to any that will buy, *are poisoners general.* They murder his Majesty's subjects by wholesale, neither does their eye pity nor spare. *They drive them to hell like sheep.* A curse is in the midst of them; the curse of God cleaves to the stones, the timber, the furniture of them. Canst thou hope to deliver down thy fields of blood to the third generation? Not so, for there is a God in heaven; therefore thy name shall soon be rooted out." This is certainly sufficiently radical even for these most radical times.

In 1773 he wrote a pamphlet on the scarcity of provision in Great Britain in which he asks, "Why is food so dear? The grand cause is because such immense quantities of corn are continually consumed by distilling. Add the distilleries throughout England, and have we not reason to believe that little less than half the wheat produced in the kingdom is every year consumed, not by so harmless a way as throwing it

into the sea, but by converting it into *deadly poison*—poison that naturally destroys not only the strength and life, but also the morals, of our countrymen."—*Works*, vol. vi, p. 275. He answers the objection that it brings revenue to the Government: "Is it indisputable that the full duty is paid for all the corn that is distilled? not to insist upon the multitudes of private stills which pay no duty at all. I have myself heard the servant of an eminent distiller occasionally aver that for every gallon he distilled which paid duty he distilled six which paid none. Yea, I have heard distillers themselves affirm, 'We must do this or we cannot live.' Would his Majesty sell a hundred thousand of his subjects yearly to Algiers for four hundred thousand pounds? Surely no. Will he then sell them for that sum to be butchered by their own countrymen?" It will be seen by this that they had "crooked whisky" in Wesley's day. Are there contemporaneous writings as strong as these in denunciation of the traffic? If so, they have not been seen by us. After a hundred years of progress, is there any thing more incisive and decisive to be found upon the subject?

In 1743 Wesley published his General Rules for the government of his Societies, one of which prohibited "drunkenness, buying or selling spirituous liquors, or drinking them, unless in cases of extreme necessity." This was the first rule of the kind published, perhaps, by any Church organization. It was seven years be-

fore the origin of temperance in Scotland, and over seventy years before the rise of the Father Mathew Societies in Ireland. And the rule was not a dead letter; for in the same year in which it was published Wesley excluded from the Society at Newcastle seventeen members for drunkenness and two for retailing spirituous liquors.

And Wesley, as a physician, discountenanced the use of spirituous or malt liquors. It should be remembered that at one time he was in the habit of prescribing gratuitously to the poor, and that his advice was largely sought, and that for this work he had carefully prepared himself by studying under suitable practitioners. (*Works*, vol. v, p. 187; vol. iii, pp. 385, 399, 414.) In 1747 he published an abridged and revised edition of Dr. Cheyne's work entitled, "The Natural Method of Curing Diseases." As a physician he says, "Water is the wholesomest of all drinks, quickens the appetite and strengthens the digestion most. Strong, and more especially spirituous, liquors are certain but slow poison. Experience shows there is very seldom any danger in leaving them off all at once. Strong liquors do not prevent the mischiefs of a surfeit, nor carry it off so safely as water. Malt liquors (except clear small beer or small ale of due age) are exceedingly hurtful to tender persons." Will not physicians in this day come up to this before long?

In the Minutes of the Conference we find these

questions: "Do you drink water? Why not? Did you ever? Why did you leave it off? If not for health when will you begin again? to-day? How often do you drink *wine* or *ale?* every day? Do you want it?" A preacher who could pass through that catechism before the Conference and still drink wine or ale instead of water would certainly do so for his stomach's sake! The questions are about equivalent, to a conscientious man, to prohibition. But what may be said of Wesley himself? In 1735, in his thirty-second year, he, in company with some Moravian missionaries, sailed for Georgia. When about sailing he writes: "Believing the denying ourselves even in the smallest instances might, by the blessing of God, be helpful to us, we wholly left off the use of flesh and wine, and confined ourselves to vegetable food, chiefly rice and biscuit." This he observed during his stay in Georgia.

When the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized in America, in 1784, the Conference adopted the General Rules of Wesley, and, of course, this one against the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage. This rule was published to the world twenty years before the publication of Dr. Rush's tract on the effects of ardent spirits on body and mind, and about twenty years before any other religious body published total abstinence as the rule of their Church, and fifty-six years before the organization of the Washingtonian Society. The liquor power has op-

posed this law as it does civil law. In 1790 it was so changed as to omit the words "buying or selling," which, of course, would allow the traffic. But in 1848 the rule in its Wesleyan integrity was restored, and it has remained to this day. The Conference and the bishops have ever been outspoken against the evil.

In 1780 the Conference said: "Do we disapprove of the practice of distilling grain into liquor? shall we disown our friends who will not renounce the practice? Yes." In 1783 the Conference reported, "Should our friends be permitted to make spirituous liquors, sell, and drink them in drams? By no means. We think it wrong in its nature and consequences, and desire all our preachers to teach the people by precept and example to put away this evil." In 1784 the General Conference said: "May our ministers or traveling preachers drink spirituous liquors? By no means, unless it be medicinally." The same Conference required the preachers "to vigorously but calmly enforce the rules concerning needless ornaments and drams." And before any preacher could be received this question among others was asked him, "Do you take no drams?" So in the General Conference of 1796 Dr. Coke and Bishop Asbury said: "Far be it from us to wish or endeavor to intrude upon the proper religious or civil liberty of any of our people; but the retailing of spirituous liquors, and giving them in drams to customers when they call at the stores, are

such prevalent customs at present, and are productive of so many evils, that we judge it our indispensable duty to form a regulation against them. The cause of God, which we prefer to every other consideration under heaven, absolutely requires us to step forth with humble boldness in this respect." That has the ring of the genuine metal. In all this there is no attempt to minify the evils of intemperance, no catering to the rum traffic.

We give below the declarations of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church at the last session, in 1872. This body had in it about one hundred and thirty laymen, judges, senators, and statesmen, from every State in the Union :—

Believing, as we do, that the Church of Christ represents and embodies the only true principles of individual and national reform, it is our settled conviction that we must rely mainly for the success of the temperance cause on her leadership and co-operation.

From the very first our Church has been bold and emphatic in her utterances and measures against the evils of intemperance.

She has waged an uncompromising and vigorous war against this, the dire foe of humanity and Christian civilization. She has clearly defined her position, unqualifiedly condemning both the sale and use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage. While we recognize this historic fact as of special significance, it is, nevertheless, true that the work of death has not yet ceased.

Intemperance still continues with unabated fury, spreading its desolating influences, like the dark wing of a tempest, over Christian and heathen lands.

It is, however, an occasion of rejoicing that the outlook is now more hopeful. Public sentiment is being aroused and directed in the right channel. In the influences that centralize in and around our national Congress there has been a marked change for the better. It is not now, as formerly, deemed an essential part of the courtesies of social life to proffer the wine-glass or other liquors. A higher Christian sentiment is gaining the ascendency. We hail this as the dawn of a new era in the temperance reform.

We may here note another feature or fact that gives promise of more definite and beneficial results. The State is waking up to the magnitude of the interests involved, and is beginning to comprehend the necessities of the case. Civil legislation, wise and heroic, is tightening its hold on the monster intemperance, and aiming a death-blow at the very seat of vitality. We believe the temperance law recently enacted in Illinois and some of the other States will prove no doubtful experiment, but will rather demonstrate the expediency of such a statutory provision, and is a harbinger of the complete and ultimate triumph of the temperance cause. God speed the day!

Let not the Church falter in view of the approaching crisis, but let her gird on her armor anew for the battle. Now is the time for action—action earnest, persistent, well directed.

While we are prepared to reaffirm our former views and commitments on this question, we believe we ought, if possible, as a Church, to take more advanced ground in enunciating a more elevated and comprehensive platform of principle, and in clearly, boldly marking out the lines of policy to be pursued. We therefore recommend for adoption the following:—

"*Resolved*, 1. That we are more than ever convinced of the absolute need of total legal prohibition as a condition of the removal of the evils of intemperance, and we here pledge our utmost endeavors to inaugurate so wise and salutary a dispensation.

"2. That while we can never be satisfied with any thing less than the entire destruction of the liquor traffic, yet we can but regard as a step toward that end the enactment of laws mak-

ing this vast system of iniquity responsible for the losses and woes which have been so recklessly inflicted upon a long-suffering and too patient people.

"3. That we not only regard the manufacture, sale, or the using of intoxicating drinks, as a beverage, morally wrong, but we also most earnestly protest against our members giving any countenance to the liquor traffic by signing petitions for license, by voting to grant license, by renting property for such purposes, or by directly helping in any other way to promote intemperance. Any one thus acting is guilty of unchristian conduct, and is subject to disciplinary action.

"4. That we should make special effort to secure the nomination and election to office of strictly temperance men.

"5. That we recommend the use of unfermented wine on our sacramental occasions."

There is a record of which Wesley would not be ashamed. There is nothing in it over which the distiller, the brewer, the seller, the drunken sot, or the fashionable home drinker, can become merry. Intemperance is, indeed, the greatest foe to success of personal piety in our home congregations, as well as in our foreign mission fields. It breeds contempt for the Sabbath and divine things, and is the fruitful progenitor of a vast majority of the evils and crimes with which society is afflicted. It seduces from the altars of the Church not the meanest, but the noblest and the best. As with the tail of a foul dragon, it sweeps from the galaxy of Church and State stars of the first magnitude. Every member who enters the pale of the Church, and every minister who takes upon him ordination vows, should consider himself pledged to a

life, both by precept and example, of total abstinence. Let this be his every-day vow :—

> "Thou sparkling bowl! thou sparkling bowl!
> Though lips of bards thy brim may press,
> And eyes of beauty o'er thee roll,
> And song and dance thy power confess,
> *I will not touch thee ;* for there clings
> A scorpion by thy side that stings."

And in this Republic every great national question must be mainly settled by the ballot. So in the settlement of this question some great political organization must assume it and make it the chief object of their political endeavor. It must have a beginning, and will meet with occasional repulses ; but, never flagging, it must go forward to national triumph. And we believe that this legalized evil is to find its historical analogue in American slavery. The latter was overthrown in an hour by the strong arm of the Government ; so let it soon be with the former. God of nations, speed the day !

CHAPTER VI.

The Public School Question: Denominational or Common Schools.

WE feel deeply impressed that we are about to consider a very important matter: the Common School System of education, and the relation of the Bible and religious instruction to that system. We have never had but one opinion upon this subject, and while holding tenaciously to that opinion we have naturally enough looked about us to see if we stood isolated and alone. Of course we were gratified when we read the "Address of the Board of Bishops," and the deliverance of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1872, because they so clearly and strongly confirmed our position. And that you may know exactly what they did say upon this subject, we will here insert, first, that part of the Address relating to the subject, and also the Report of the Committee on Education:—

> In this connection we cannot refrain from warning you against the efforts of a corrupt and decaying hierarchy to regain its power by obtaining control of, or destroying, the Public School System of our country. The bond between intelligence and public virtue is so evident that it is only necessary to remind you of this in order to secure your earnest support of that system of universal primary education, which we must regard as the great conservator of Protestant liberty.

The following (Report No. I of the Committee on Education) was unanimously adopted by a rising vote:—

"The Committee on Education, having carefully considered that portion of the Bishops' Address that relates to the Common Schools, would report as follows, namely:—

"*Whereas*, We have always, as a Church, accepted the work of education as a duty enjoined by our commission 'to teach all nations;' and,

"*Whereas*, The system of Common Schools is an indispensable safeguard to republican institutions; and,

"*Whereas*, The combined and persistent assaults of the Romanists and others endanger the very existence of our Common Schools; therefore,

"*Resolved*, 1. That we will co-operate in every effort which is fitted to make our Common Schools more efficient and permanent.

"2. That it is our firm conviction that to divide the Common School funds among religious denominations for educational purposes is wrong in principle, and hostile to our free institutions and the cause of education.

"3. That we will resist all means which may be employed to exclude from the Common Schools the Bible, which is the chart of our liberties, and the inspiration of our civilization."

There is not a preamble, nor resolution, nor sentence, nor phrase, in the above that we would have exscinded. And so far as any action of the General Conference can commit the Church to any measure, the whole Church stands committed to the Common School System and to the Bible in the schools.

It should also be remembered that that Conference was a large body, both of ministers and laymen, and that these representative men were from the different political parties and from every State and Territory in

the Union ; and also that this report was adopted, not simply by a bare majority, but *unanimously, and by a rising vote* And we hope and believe that no subsequent General Conference will ever reverse this action.

"We must educate, we *must* educate," was the emphatic declaration of one who, from the stand-point of a statesman, viewed the education of the masses as a political necessity. He viewed ignorance and pauperism, and ignorance and crime, as being, the one the cause, and the other the effect. Indeed, so close is this relation that a celebrated French writer asserts, that every nation makes its paupers and criminals. This is, in an important sense, true wherever the means for preventing pauperism and crime are not as great as the State can reasonably furnish. For nearly one hundred years this nation, by its congressional and State legislation, has shown that, it has regarded the system of primary education, as given in our Common Schools, as the surest and greatest preventive of crime that the State can supply. And if the State is to furnish any general system of education, we think it will be admitted that in general it cannot do more or better than it is now doing. It cannot build and endow colleges for the few, but it can rightly tax the people for the elementary training of the many. The Common School is the people's college, and it exists for the sake of the people.

But if we are to give up a general system of education—national so far that each State has a system, though not strictly a uniform one—what shall we have in its stead? Nothing? With no system of education we would inevitably recede, to a great extent, into a state of ignorance, and ultimately, perchance, into barbarism. Shall we, then, have Denominational Schools? How would they be more efficient in reaching the masses of the children? Can any one furnish a reason why there would be a greater aggregate number of children in these Denominational Schools than are now found in the Common Schools? Would each denomination reach all that properly might be claimed as under their religious or ecclesiastical control? Where the Romanists have their separate schools there are hundreds of their children not found therein. Has each denomination its proper per cent. of the school population in its Sunday-schools? Very far from it; and upon what principle do we expect to be more successful with denominational week-day schools than with denominational Sunday-schools? But some object to the Public Schools because of their alleged sectarian and religious character; and if so, what would such do when these schools shall become decidedly denominational? Objectors to the existing American system of education would be in such a helpless minority as that they could not support schools for themselves; and to be obliged to send their children to a Methodist, or

Presbyterian, or Catholic school, would not be more acceptable to them than to patronize the Common Schools as they now are. We ask, then, these opponents to pause and consider before they join hands with those who would destroy the Common School System as it now is.

But aside from the towns and cities, where the evils would be possibly the least, what shall be the case with Denominational Day-schools in the rural districts? With the present system there is oftentimes only one school in a whole township for all the different denominations represented in that township. Now, separate these families into denominations, and it will be seen that it would be impossible to have a day-school for each of these denominations. But it might be said that if any one denomination was numerous enough to support a day-school the rest might send their children to the school upon agreed terms. But would that be less objectionable than to send them to the schools as they now are? The Romanists, as a rule, would suffer less in one respect by these Denominational Schools than the Protestants, as their population is, for the most part, in the cities, and therefore closer together, and so could be more easily supplied with schools. But they would suffer more by them in another respect. They complain now that their children turn Protestant through the influence of the Public Schools; an influence which we do not think belongs more to the Common

Schools than it does to the common society in which the children mingle; for we have never heard of attempts, small or great, by any teacher to purposely change the religion of a scholar. But if Denominational Schools were established it would certainly be for denominational as well as educational purposes; and hence all the Catholic children who might attend them, in the rural districts or elsewhere, would be under this direct influence, and would be most likely to turn Protestant. And we may be allowed to say that Methodists have, perhaps, less to fear from Denominational Schools than any other people. They are really the most numerous and wealthy denomination, and can, therefore, establish the most schools, and receive the greatest benefit. But still they are among the strongest defenders of the Public School System.

Let us now look at the history and magnitude of Common Schools. As early as 1785, two years before the formation of the Constitution of the United States, Congress passed an "ordinance for ascertaining the mode of disposing of the lands in the Western Territory." This ordinance devoted a thirty-sixth part of every township to "the maintenance of Public Schools within said township." Two years after this Congress added to this statement the following, that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This was the very year of the formation of the Federal Constitution; and no subsequent legislation of Congress has ever receded from this

position. Thus the Public School System began its history coeval with the constitutional history of the nation, and both have grown up to be the wonder and admiration of the world.

Perhaps the first man in the United States to suggest the general establishment of Common Schools, entirely free from sectarian or ecclesiastical control, was Governor Clinton, of the State of New York. In his annual message to the Legislature of 1795 he said: "While it is evident that the general establishment and liberal endowment of academies are highly to be commended, and are attended with the most beneficial consequences, yet it cannot be denied that they are principally confined to the children of the opulent, and that a great portion of the community is excluded from their immediate advantages. The establishment of Common Schools throughout the State is happily calculated to remedy this inconvenience and will, therefore, engage your early and decided consideration." This wise suggestion was promptly considered, and the result was the authorization and adoption of Common Schools throughout the State. It is true that previous to this there were schools in various parts of New England, but perhaps not entirely free from Church control, and supported entirely by the State—and such is only properly a Public School. This system of education so harmonized with the public judgment that it was in a short time adopted by most of the Northern and Middle

States; it never did find a general acceptance through the South. While, perhaps, all the Southern States in time adopted the measure in some form, yet it was never popular, especially with the planters, who preferred their own private or select schools.

Political aristocracy and ecclesiastical hierarchy never warmly supported general education; but a true republicanism and a liberal ecclesiasticism have ever encouraged the education of the masses.

How popular the system of Common Schools has ever been in the nation is best shown by the magnificent greatness to which it has grown. There are in the United States not less than 125,059 Public Schools, supported and controlled by the State. There are in these schools not less than 183,198 teachers, and 6,228,060 pupils. Nearly one sixth of the entire population is in the Public Schools! The State is paying for the yearly support of these schools not less than $64,030,673. But are these schools increasing or diminishing?

During the past ten years (the chief period of agitation) the increase in the number of Public Schools has been 17,179, and the increase has thus been more than a thousand and a half for each year of the ten. The increase in the number of teachers has been 52,099, more than one third. The increase in the funds for their support, in paying teachers and erecting buildings, has been $41,482,123. Who can fully estimate the value of such a grand and wide-spread

system on the general elementary enlightenment of the youth of the nation! By virtue of this system, mainly, the number of illiterates in the nation is decreasing *pro rata* by thousands year by year, as the statistics show. And as general intelligence is an essential for the perpetuity of a Government, and more especially for the perpetuity of a Republic, would it not be folly to abandon this system? Nay, more, would it not be suicidal? Yet we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there are many among us in these latter days, citizens of these various States, who openly declaim against it, and persistently seek its destruction!

This hostility first revealed itself in the city of New York about 1840. More recently the opponents have demanded that the Bible be excluded from the school-room. They ask also for a *pro rata* division of the school fund, and even now, in some places, get the lion's share. Without following the various items in the history of this unhappy controversy, it is enough to say that the objective point is at last disclosed to us by the complainants themselves. Is it simply to exclude the Bible from the schools? In localities where this has been done have the schools, as a rule, been perceptibly increased in numbers by the attendance of the children of these objectors? Would they be willing to allow the Public Schools to exist if they had in them their share of the instructors? Every intelligent opponent, who will speak the

full candor of his heart, will say *no* to each and all of these questions.

The lovers of the Public School should know it, and know it now, that their opponents are carrying on a war of subjugation or a war of extermination. The exclusion of the Bible, the partition of the funds, are but the outposts to the general capture. They seek to capture or demolish this system, and then upon its ruins to build up their own system of instruction. Shall this be allowed?

But here let us put the question, Is not this nation, in its general facts and acts of history, in its fundamental principles and constitutions and laws, specifically a Protestant nation? We hold that it is, and has been from the first, essentially and formally, constitutionally and legislatively, a Protestant Christian nation. Protestantism planted the first colony at Jamestown, in 1607. In 1619 a general assembly of that colony was called to receive their charter, and it was opened by prayer, and it is said they received their charter "with thanks to Almighty God." We need only refer to the history of the Puritans before and from the time of their landing in 1620, to indicate the intense Protestantism of New England. And it should be known that every one of the thirteen colonies was founded by Protestants save one, (Maryland,) and that by Lord Baltimore, a liberal Catholic.

In the Continental Congress of March, 1778, a fast was ordered for Friday, the 17th of the May follow-

ing. In the resolution by which the matter was introduced, we find such phrases as, "to publicly acknowledge the overruling providence of God," and that they might obtain "pardon and forgiveness" "through the merits and mediation of Jesus Christ." This is not the language of Pagans, Jews, Romanists, or Infidels, but of Protestants.

During the whole period of the Revolution no conviction was deeper or more general than that the colonists should rely upon Almighty God for forgiveness of sins, and for final victory. And, perhaps, no man among all the patriots of that day felt himself more dependent upon the Christian's God than did George Washington, both while commanding the colonial forces and while president of the United States. Besides his numerous proclamations, which indicate this, when the hopes of others failed he retires in secret and is found upon his knees praying that God might save his bleeding country. And even when he first assumed command of the camp around Boston, Governor Trumbull, of Connecticut, wrote him saying, "May the God of the armies of Israel give you wisdom and fortitude, cover your head in the day of battle and danger, and convince our enemies that all their attempts to deprive these colonies of their rights and liberties are vain!" What a grand recognition of God as the source of wisdom, power, and protection! Washington, in his brief reply, did not fall below this when he said: "Divine Providence,

which wisely orders the affairs of men, will enable us to discharge our duty with fidelity and success." And in that immortal declaration—the Declaration of Independence—those patriots acknowledge "the laws of nature and of nature's God," and that man has a divine Creator, who has endowed him with his inalienable rights; and they appeal to "the supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of their intentions;" and, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, "they mutually pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor."

During the war of the Revolution the Americans occasionally appointed set times of intercession to God, as well as days of thanksgiving for signal victories. At the surrender of Lord Cornwallis Congress adjourned to a Lutheran Church, "to render thanks to Almighty God for crowning the allied arms with success." The war over, and Washington elected president, he says: "It would be peculiarly improper to omit, in this first official act, my fervent supplications to that almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes." "In tendering this homage to the great Author of every public and private good, I assure myself that it expresses your senti-

ments not less than my own, nor those of my fellow-citizens at large less than either." Were these men skeptics and freethinkers? Now, if this representation of personal and public sentiment was true, (and there are none to contradict it,) then this Republic was Christian in its incipiency and formation. It was not, then, equally heathen, Jewish, or infidel; it was and is a Christian nation. In the national adoption of the Christian calendar, and in all the general legislation touching upon moral questions, there is a fundamental recognition of the Christian religion; perhaps quite as much so as is safe to continue the proper relation of Church and State. And while all forms of belief and disbelief may, within certain limits, exist here under the protection of the Government, and therefore can legally claim protection, it is still true that the Christian religion is the legally dominant faith of the Republic; and it can never be otherwise without a revolution of our constitutional enactments, and an utter repudiation of our political antecedents. May God in his providence avert such a national disaster!

But we will take an advance step, and claim that ours is a *Protestant* Christian nation. This has been the essential nature of what we have said in proof that we are not pagan or infidel. But let us furnish the specific proof by showing that the nation is founded upon a Protestant Bible—and a Protestant Christianity—and that very early it indorsed this book, and provided for its introduction, and recommended

its general circulation. Again, the nation recognized the Bible not only in its immortal Declaration, and in the expressed opinions of its leading statesmen, but in receiving and acting on a memorial presented to Congress as early as 1777 asking for aid in supplying the Holy Scriptures. The committee to whom this matter was referred reported, "That the use of the Bible and its importance are so great that your committee refer the above to the consideration of Congress; and if Congress shall not think it expedient to order the importation of types and paper, the committee recommend that Congress will order the Committee of Commerce to import TWENTY THOUSAND Bibles from Holland, Scotland, or elsewhere, into the different ports of the States of the Union." Which was carried, and the Committee of Commerce was so ordered.

Why did not the Committee order the importation of these Bibles from France, with whom we had such intimate relations during the war, or from some other Catholic country, instead of those Protestant countries? For the reasons that these countries did not have them to freely sell; and, in the next place, this nation did not want a Catholic Bible, with its perversions and glosses; it wanted one better suited to the genius of the nation—a Protestant Bible for a Protestant nation; and it was only an embargo that prevented the completion of this project. But again, in 1782, Congress passed a "National Act in

behalf of the Bible." It encouraged a Mr. Aitkin, of Philadelphia, to publish an edition, saying that Congress believed that it would "be subservient to the interests of religion," and they "recommended it to the inhabitants of the United States."—PECK'S *History of the Great Republic*, p. 328.

Thus early, even before the definite treaty of peace with England was signed, and five years before the adoption of the American Constitution, did the Congress of the nation recommend the Bible—the Protestant Bible—to the inhabitants of the whole nation. Is not this, then, precedently and pre-eminently, a Protestant Christian nation?

CHAPTER VII.

The Public School Question: Christian Aspect of Common Law.

THE opponents of Protestantism are usually agreed in denying the right of the Government to enforce the legal observance of the Sabbath. The Jew does not believe in the Christian Sabbath, and the infidel may not believe in any Sabbath, and the Catholic denies the right of the State to interfere in the matter. Saint Liguori, one of the most eminent divines that has ever lived in that Church, says: "The pope has the right and the power to declare that the sanctification of the Lord's day shall only continue a few hours, and that any servile works may be done on that day." Thus instead of Christ being the Lord of the Sabbath the pope is. Among the works allowed to be done are, sowing and reaping, hunting and fishing, horseshoeing and repairing, merchandizing, bull-fights, plays, etc. The "New York Tablet" of June, 1868, says: "They [the Protestants] may keep it as the Jewish Sabbath if they please, but we claim the liberty to keep it as a Christian holiday, within the rules prescribed by the Church." To them the Sabbath is but a holiday! They will keep the Sabbath as the Church directs, and not, also, as the law requires; and the Church may direct, as we

have seen, that any secular work may be done therein. In view of such teaching is it any wonder that in our cities, on the Sabbath day, the peaceable, worshiping, law-abiding congregations should be interfered with, broken up, by the batter and bang of their lawless revelries? Thus they link arms with those who would destroy all Bibles, all Sabbaths, and all religions.

The Public School System has of late been called very hard names, such as "godless," "a swindle," "an outrage," "a huge humbug," and its schools "pits of destruction," "schools of infidelity and immorality," and as "having come from the devil." Now, if the system and its schools be all this, or any part of it, they should be abandoned at once. But if we be required to give over the instruction of the young into the hands of the Romanists, then let us ask them, What kind of instruction will you give? what will be the character of that education which you will impart? This can only be answered by stating the kind of education received in those schools over which they now have control. And upon this, so important a matter, let no outsider be heard; let one speak who for eighteen years was editor of a quarterly in the interests of the Roman Church, entitled, "Brownson's Review." In 1862 Mr. Brownson wrote an article on "Catholic Schools." Here is what he says: "As far as we are able to trace the effects of the most approved Catholic education of our day, whether at

home or abroad, it tends to repress rather than quicken the life of the pupil; to unfit rather than prepare him for the active and zealous discharge either of his religious or social duties." Mark these words; they are important. Their system tends to *repress* rather than *develop*, to unfit rather than to fit, the youth for the duties of life! Is this what Americans want? Remember, also, that this is said, not of their system of education in South America, or in Spain, but in the United States; it is not some effete system of centuries ago, but, the writer says, the *best approved system of to-day*. He says, further, "Comparatively few of them (Catholic graduates) take their stand as scholars, or as men on a level with the Catholics of non-Catholic colleges, and those who do take that stand do it by throwing aside nearly all they learned from their Alma Mater, and adopting the ideas and principles, the modes of thought and action, they find in the general civilization of the country in which they live." That is, few of these graduates become truly learned men, and those who do owe it to the better systems which surround them. One more quotation is all that our space will allow: "The cause of the failure of what we call Catholic education is, in our judgment, in the fact that we educate, not for the present or future, but for the past." Says one of the professors in the University of Catania: "What has natural philosophy been from the time of Newton to our own? A myth. What is Newton's theory of attraction?

The height of extravagance. Who are the most thought-confusing sophists in the world? The astronomers, with their attraction and gravitation, and the natural philosophers, with their mechanical theory of heat." No wonder that that eloquent Spanish orator, Castelar, declared in the presence of the Roman prelates in the Spanish Cortes, "There is not a single progressive principle which has not been cursed by the Catholic Church. Not a constitution has been born, not a single progress made, not a solitary reform effected, which has not been nurtured under the terrible anathemas of the Church."

But it is claimed by some that we should wholly secularize the system of education in our Common Schools. What is meant by this? Does it mean to exclude from the text-books every thing of a religious nature? Does it also mean to forbid the teacher from uttering any thing, even of the most general character, that is religious? to prohibit the children singing any thing that has God in it? Nothing short of this would make it absolutely secular. Now, we hold that such a course would be utterly impossible. No truth is more firmly settled than that man is a religious being; and hence every literary production of his mind will, in much or little, bear the impress of this innate religious nature. It is true that the abstract sciences, such as complex equations and extended logarithms, have no such nature.

No man can write a true history of the race, and

entirely omit the religion of the race. No man can write a true history of this country and omit all reference to Christianity. Are our children to study history? And if so, shall they study a true one or a false one? a perfect or an imperfect one? But if the text-books could be wholly secularized, what teacher would enter into an agreement that he would not mention any religious subject in the school-room, no matter whether that teacher were a skeptic or a believer? Children are the same, both at school and at home, and spontaneously they will ask religious questions; and would you engage to attempt to smother these proper inquiries by saying, in a tone of authority, "That is not a proper question here;" or, placing your finger upon your lip, say, "I am not allowed to tell?" Would you engage to teach the child all about the things that are made, and never speak of the Maker? Would you engage to speak all about a painting, and never speak of the painter?

Professor Tayler Lewis has wisely said: "We cannot cut out religion, revelation, and worship without giving a mortal wound to poetry, art, philosophy; to all that is highest to our human thinking; to all that makes us something more than merely the most sagacious and most inventive of the animal race. Education is an infinite ascent. The Author of our wondrous being has so connected the *scala* or ladder of ideas that the lower thus inevitably fastens on to the higher and loses its chief value,

its very identity, we may say, by any unnatural severance. Every thing of most importance, even as connected with our secular well-being, runs up into theology."

But, it may be said, they would be allowed to teach the children morals. But what kind of morals? Pagan morals? Mohammedan morals? Hindu morals? for there is no system of morals which is not founded upon religion. Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as natural morals separate from religious morals, and religion precedes morality. I know it is said, "Let the children be instructed in religion, if desired, at home, or in the Sunday-school, or at the church." But it is known that thousands of these children have not religious parents, neither are they found in the Sunday-school nor at Church. And it requires no superior observation to see that, let all the Churches do all they can or will do, still there will be thousands of children who, if they receive no general religious training in the Public School, will never receive any at all. It is simply, then, a question for the State to consider, whether it is best that thousands of its future citizens shall grow up without any religious instruction? We say it is not best to do so, for, in the language of Coleridge, "If you bring up your children in a way which puts them out of sympathy with the religious feeling of the nation in which they live, the chances are that they will ultimately turn out ruffians or fanatics, and one as likely as the other." We hold

this sentiment to be true and good. The State ought not, therefore, to jeopardize its peace and prosperity by the attempt to educate any portion of its prospective citizens irreligiously or denominationally. Listen to the father of his country as he speaks to his children in the following language: "Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. And let us with *caution* indulge *the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion.* Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in *exclusion* of religious principle." These wise cautions have been heeded by the nation during its first century, and, heeding them, we have become strong among the nations of the earth. Shall we enter upon our second century disregarding these fatherly admonitions?

It would not be difficult to prove that Christianity teaches the best system of morals that has ever been taught, and Christianity is founded upon the Bible. And a moral philosophy cut loose from religion would be defective and untrue, as a half truth is a whole falsehood; for man is not only a moral being, but he is also a religious being. If, therefore, you teach

moral philosophy correctly, you must teach religion. In all the schools of the past absolutely secular literary teaching has been unknown, whether in pagan or Christian lands. It cannot be.

But why should we be asked to try the experiment now? By far the greater portion of the complainants are now calling our schools *godless*, and what would they say of them then? Would they patronize them then? The Romanists claim that teaching is not a function of the State, but of the Church. One of the items *condemned* by the pope's syllabus of 1865 was that, "The most advantageous conditions of civil society require that popular schools, open without distinction to all children of the people, and public establishments destined to teach young people letters and good discipline, and to impart to them education, should be *freed from all ecclesiastical authority* and interference, and should be fully subjected to the civil and political powers, for the teaching of matters and opinions common to the times." They cannot consistently patronize public secular schools. The "New York Tablet" has said: "The School Board of Cincinnati have voted, we see from the papers, to exclude the Bible and all religious instruction from the Public Schools. If this has been done with a view to reconciling Catholics to the Common School System its purpose will not be realized; for to us godless schools are still less acceptable than sectarian schools, and we object less to the reading of King James's

Bible, even, in the schools than we do to the exclusion of all religious instruction. American Protestantism of the orthodox stamp is a far less evil than German infidelity."

This is certainly plain and honest. But the plan is to secularize the schools, and then pass a compulsory law compelling attendance. This, we hold, is little less than cruelty. Why not pass such a law now, if it must be done at all—which would be less objectionable to them, and far better for general culture? The objection of some infidels to general religious instruction is not so much on the score of religious liberty as because of conscience. Admitting their demand in this respect, we would, to be consistent, be compelled to abrogate the laws that compel the legal observance of the Sabbath, as also all laws against blasphemy and profanity. Should not the general and historical sentiments of the nation prevail, rather than the individual and varying consciences of the few? This demand of the few to exclude the Bible is like this: As a father you have raised up a family under the influence of the Bible. Your children have heard you read it night and morning. That old family Bible is familiar and dear. A man stops with you over night. The old Bible comes out as usual. The man says, "Put down that Bible; I don't want to hear it; my conscience is against it." I think that father and mother and children would all combine to put *him* out rather than put out the old Bible.

It ought to be broadly asserted that Christianity is a part of the common law of the land. It has been frequently so decided by the best legal minds in the nation; and perhaps no one has gone over the whole subject with so much care as did Judge Duncan, who delivered the opinion of the court at the September term of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, in 1824, in the case of Updegraph *versus* the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. It was a case of blasphemy, and the judge says he understands the case to have been carried up for the purpose of testing whether Christianity was a part of the common law of the land. Hence he gave that point most careful attention. He rehearsed the common law of England, went carefully over the history of the colonies, the formation of the Federal and State Constitutions, and time and again asserted and proved that Christianity, general Christianity, is the common law of the land; not a Christianity of any one creed, but a Christianity founded upon the holy Bible. The judge mentioned three offenses indictable at common law: "1. Maliciously denying the being and providence of God; 2. Contumelious reproaches of Jesus Christ; profane and malevolent scoffing at the Scriptures, or exposing any part of them to contempt and ridicule; 3. Certain immoralities tending to subvert all religion and morality, which are the foundations of all Governments." "Without these restraints," he says, "no free Government could long exist. It is liberty run mad to

declaim against the punishment of these offenses, or to assert that the punishment of them is hostile to the spirit and genius of our Government." In harmony with this eminent decision the Government appoints chaplains to the national and State legislatures, to the army and navy, to the prisons and asylums and reformatory institutions. And all the statute laws of the various States touching upon religion or moral questions are mainly founded upon Christianity, and these laws are certainly not in conflict with the Constitution of the United States. And it is only by virtue of this doctrine that Christianity is the common law of the land that we hope as a nation soon to wipe off that disgrace to our country, Mormonism. Christianity, then, is a part of the common law of the land, not in the same sense as is Judaism, or Mohammedanism, or Buddhism, or Confucianism, or Mormonism, or Materialism. It is the moral sentiment of the nation, more or less expressed in its laws.

Another decision touching this point was rendered in January, 1870, by Chief-Justice Sharswood, of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. Briefly stated, these are the facts: Levi Nice, in his will, devised a life estate to two grand nieces, and at the death of both the real estate was to go to the building of a hall for the Infidel Society of Philadelphia, in which to discuss "religion, politics," etc. The court decided the devise void for two reasons: 1. At the date of the will no such incorporated society existed in Pennsyl-

vania, nor was it likely that the Legislature would ever incorporate such a society. 2. No competent trustee of the devise was named in the will. The judge then proceeds to make some remarks upon Christianity and the State, some of which we give as follows: "The laws and institutions of the State are built on the foundation of reverence for Christianity." "Indeed," he continues, "I would go further, and adopt the sentiment and language of Mr. Justice Duncan in the case referred to: 'It would prove a nursery of vice, a school of preparation to qualify young men for the gallows and young women for the brothel; and there is not a skeptic of decent manners and good morals who would not consider such a debating club as a *common nuisance* and a *disgrace* to the city.'" This is strong language and from a strong source. Out, then, with the idea that the State is as much infidel as Christian! This is a Christian nation. Now, then, this general Christianity has issued from, or is founded upon, the Bible, and to teach this is not properly sectarianism.

This point has also been decided in the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania by Judge Story, the best expounder of constitutional law. This was so decided in the famous Girard will case. Referring to the will of the testator, he says: "All that we can gather from his language is that he desired to exclude from the college sectarians and sectarianism." Agreeable with this he says, "The Bible, and especially the New

Testament, without note, may be read and taught as a divine revelation in the college, its general precepts expounded, its evidences explained, and its glorious principles of morality inculcated. What is there to prevent any work not sectarian upon the evidences of Christianity from being read and taught in the college by lay teachers? . . . Where can the purest principles of morality be learned so clearly or so perfectly as from the New Testament? Where are benevolence, the love of truth, sobriety, and industry, so powerfully and irresistibly inculcated as in the sacred volume?" According to this learned jurist all this can be taught, and still Girard College be an unsectarian school. Can we not, then, have the Bible read in Common Schools by laymen, and an occasional religious song, and still they be unsectarian? And the Bible, even the Protestant Bible, is not properly a sectarian book, for this is the one the judge meant. The Bible of the Romanists is a sectarian book, as much so as is Clarke's Commentary; for they publish the Bible with their Church notes attached. But the Bible without note or comment is an unsectarian book. Protestantism is no more a sect than Christianity, including Romanism, is a sect.

Thus it is established that the Christianity of this nation is based upon a Protestant Bible. This is our national standard of morals. In every department of thought there ought to be some final court of appeal, some ultimate authority. This is true of law, of med-

icine, of science, and of religion. In every nation where there have been books or manuscripts it has been found that some one of them has been acknowledged supreme in authority in matters of religious belief and practice. I know of only one nation that ever denied this in theory, and attempted to carry it out in practice. The French nation, for a short time, denounced all creeds, struck down the Bible as a standard, cast out Jesus from the temple, and symbolized and enthroned human reason as the supreme object of faith and worship; and what was the direful result the student of history well knows. Seeing that our shores are pressed by the feet of every race, it has become a matter of intense interest that we shall continue to have an ultimate and universal standard of appeal on all moral questions. The Bible and the Public School constitute the rock upon which this temple is built, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. In the language of Horace Greeley, "These are our corner-stones, and if our nation stands, it must stand on these."

Still it may be asked, What can be done to restore national quiet on this subject? While we would not be considered as dictating a course of legislation to be adopted, yet we may be permitted to submit some suggestions that appear to us to be highly needful.

Let the subject be as far removed from the arena of party politics and ecclesiastical interference as it may be; for if it remains within the easy reach of

either it may be resorted to at any time as a means to an end. As an initial step to this legislation let the Common Schools be understood to be what they really are, not partisan, nor sectarian, but Government schools. Then let the General Government affix an amendment to its Constitution requiring every State to establish and maintain Common Schools, as this is a matter in which all the States. as constituent parts of the nation, are concerned. If this matter is left to the option of each State and county, it will be a fruitful source of agitation, and only some of them may adopt the measure, thus leaving a portion of the population without the means of that elementary education so needful for good citizenship.

Add to this amendment another, forbidding the appropriation of any part of the School Fund, or of any of the public funds, to any one of the religious sects, for any purpose whatever. Let Congress prescribe the course of study and the text-books to be used in these schools, this to be revised by Congress once in five years, specifying as unchangeable that there shall be a Bible without note or comment in each school-room, to be read publicly or not in the school by the teacher at his own option. This will settle the question of the Bible in the schools, and it seems to us that nothing else will. Fixing the *maximum* of studies to be pursued will prevent that perplexity in many places of the few desiring to run the Common School up into a college at the expense of the

many. This will also remove that greatest evil of modern times in the schools, that of a ceaseless changing of text-books—an evil more felt in the towns and cities by the removals from ward to ward, and pressing most heavily upon the poor—as well as give, for at least five years, a national uniformity to text-books; so that in cases of removal pupils may be graded right into another school, according to their just merits and without dissatisfaction.

Lastly, such an arrangement would more likely secure more efficient teachers. If we have a uniform course of study and of text-books every teacher will know definitely what he must be prepared to teach. Our Normal Schools will be rendered much more efficient by having a specified course of study in which to train the teachers.

We have now done. What are our final conclusions? Let the Bible remain in the Public School. Let it lie side by side on the teacher's desk with Webster's Dictionary: the one the standard of the language, the other the standard of the morals. Let the Bible be read in the hearing of the children; and, as occasion seems to suggest, in the most inoffensive way let the most general principles of Christianity be both taught and sung. Labor to make the school so attractive and efficient as to command the respect and support even of adversaries, and our Public Schools will receive the continued support of the American people.

PART II.

LIBERAL CHARACTER AND TENDENCY OF THE CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

Liberal Views of Church Government.

THE importance of a well-defined creed and ecclesiastical polity is now very generally conceded. The old objection, that creeds have filled the world with different and contrary religious beliefs, is wholly untenable. It is entirely illogical. It is placing the cause for the effect. If the time ever were when all Christians had one creed and that creed the Bible, then how did they come to have different creeds? Most evidently their different understanding and interpretation and exposition of the Scriptures led to the formation of different creeds. Hence different beliefs produced different creeds, and not *vice versa.* But is it any more improper for one man, or a company of men, to write and publish his or their creed, than it is to write and preach it? Hence it is not correct to charge the fatherhood of the different sects upon the different written creeds. A clearly defined form of organization is of acknowledged importance among all secular bodies. Why should it not be so among Churches? That organization which

looks after the interests of the soul should be as equitable and scriptural in form as possible. But where the Scripture is silent human authority may lawfully interpose, yet so that nothing be ordained against the word of God. Bad government is to be deprecated every-where, and surely not less in the Church than in the State. That it has worked untold injury to the bodies and souls of men is patent to all readers of church history. Oppression and wrong in the Church can no more stand before the increasing light of intelligence and Christianity than they can in the State. But how did bad church government originate? In general, by subjecting the spirit to the letter; by making that primary which should have ever remained secondary.

If the government of the primitive Church was purely righteous and divine, and the laity were sovereign in power, that polity could not be changed so as to become wicked and oppressive unless the membership first became backslidden and sinful. Therefore it is not correct to charge the crimes of the Dark Ages directly upon the government of the Church. To say that bad government was the cause of the first step downward is to say that the apostolic government was bad. The degeneracy began with the sovereign people. This Republic can never become a monarchy unless the sovereign people shall so far degenerate as to choose a king. The primitive republican Church could not become an ecclesiastical

despotism unless the sovereign people should first so far backslide as to prefer a pope.

Certainly it is a comfort to know that it is the common verdict of the truly Christian world that the letter of a law is not of as much importance as the spirit; that the mere form of Church government is not of equal value with the great soul-saving doctrines of the Gospel of Christ; that the external form of the Church is not of as much consequence as its internal life and power. Let the Church but possess the fullness of the indwelling of the Spirit of God, and it will easily and naturally take on itself a proper and equitable form of government. Methodism originated in a spirit of fervor and of vital godliness. What form she should assume was not her first or equal concern. Her system of government was gradually and providentially developed from the Holy Club of Oxford into the complete organization of a Christian Church. A man who will teach that the form of church government is of equal importance to the thrilling, comforting, sanctifying doctrines of the Bible, should, at least, first renounce his claim to be a Protestant. And, further, such a position is neither in accordance with the teaching of Christ or of his apostles. They do teach that church government is of importance, but of secondary importance. Even Micah (vi, 6-8) teaches this most sublime truth, although yet living under the ceremonial law: "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God?

shall I come before him with burnt-offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good; and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" What does this inspired language teach, unless it be the supreme importance of an internal, inwrought disposition of heart which will lead us to a life of righteousness before God and man? Forms and ceremonies, however scriptural—sacrifices, even as costly as ten thousands of rivers of oil—can never produce such a heart and life as God requires. Listen to the infallible Teacher, as he compares the merits of form and spirit, (Matt. xxiii, 23:) "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith: these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone."

Most evidently what Jesus teaches here is, that while we should not omit form or ceremony, we should chiefly and honestly and earnestly insist on purity of heart. So did the apostles. They went about preaching, not church polity, but Jesus and the resurrection. Their general teaching and practice was, "The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life." And while they

did not neglect the administration of discipline, yet the doctrines of Christ were of paramount importance. Amputation is sometimes necessary for the health and safety of the human body. So is it with the Church. And the way to prevent these amputations and keep the Church healthy and pure is not to keep on cutting with the scalpel or pruning-knife, but to preach, with the demonstration of the Spirit and of power, the health-giving doctrines of the Bible, which will cause the life-giving current of the blood of Christ to be infused into the Church body, thus preserving it without blemish, or spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing. O for the cleansing blood of Christ to be sprinkled upon all the Churches! The Jews did not purify their Church by beheading John the Baptist, or crucifying Christ, or stoning Stephen. The Roman Church did not cleanse itself by thundering its anathemas from the Vatican, or burning the heretics at the stake. The Church of England did not promote its purity by mobbing John Wesley, or by persecuting his innocent followers. No church polity, however scriptural or rigorous, can preserve the purity of the Church. The great antidote to spiritual corruption and decay is the life-inspiring doctrines of the Gospel, accompanied by the energy of the Spirit, which quickeneth and giveth life. This has been the scriptural position and glory of the Methodist Episcopal Church from her origin, and by it she has seen her worst foes converted into her fastest friends.

May she never let go this palladium of her power in the world!

> "On such a theme 'twere impious to be calm;
> Passion is reason, transport, temper here!"

Says Watson, adopting the language of Bishop Tomline: "As it has not pleased our almighty Father to prescribe any particular form of civil government for the security of temporal comforts to his rational creatures, so neither has he prescribed any particular form of ecclesiastical polity as absolutely necessary to the attainment of eternal happiness. Thus the Gospel only lays down general principles, and leaves the application of them to men as free agents." —*Institutes*, vol. ii, p. 585.

Says Dr. Bangs, in his "Original Church of Christ," (book xiii:) "No specific form of church government is prescribed in Scripture."

Say M'Clintock and Strong, (vol. ii, 327:) "This guidance does not imply that its particular form (of government) must have been given to them by Christ, but only such direction as would lead them to pursue the wisest methods." And then, referring to certain authors who believed that the apostles adopted the synagogue as their pattern, they say: "It is by no means certain that they adopted any model."

Says Bishop Morris, in his "Church Polity:" "We do not contend, however, that any specific form of church government is essential. The Gospel is des-

tined to prevail among all nations, and their social and political conditions are so diversified that the same prudential rules and regulations would not be applicable to all of them."

Says Wesley: "As to my own judgment, I still believe the episcopal form of church government to be scriptural and apostolical. I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is *prescribed* in Scripture I do not believe. I think he (Stillingfleet) has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor his apostles prescribed any particular form of church government."

Says Pressensé, the latest, and, perhaps, clearest, writer on the early days of Christianity: "The farther we go back in the history of the Church the more indefinite in character are all ecclesiastical offices. Their limits are not clearly or precisely laid down." Again he says: "The organization of the Church is as supple as it is simple, and accommodates itself to the various exigencies of its situation, avoiding only any concession to error or to evil."—*Apostolic Era.*

Says the learned Schaff in his "History of the Apostolic Church," (p. 498:) "The Lord himself gave no particular directions on the subject, (church government,) but left his disciples to the guidance of the Holy Ghost." As it respects the conformity to the Jewish synagogue he says: "We must here observe, however, that the analogy (not conformity) which un-

deniably exists between the constitution of the apostolic Church and that of the Jewish synagogue must not be pedantically pushed, as it has been by many, to all the offices and to the minutest details. It holds in reality only in the constitution of single congregations—only, therefore, in the offices of presbyter and deacon; and even here we must not overlook those differences which necessarily grew out of the essential dissimilarity of the Christian and the Jewish principles."

These we regard as liberal and correct ideas. As to whether there existed a definite form of polity the same eminent author says, (p. 541:) "We have no passage in the New Testament which prescribes three orders, or any particular form of church government, excepting the ministry itself, as essential to the existence of the Church; and history abundantly proves that Christian life has flourished under various forms of government." These thoughts are of the same liberal and true kind. There is nothing of narrowness or bigotry or dogmatism about them. They simply speak the truth as it is in history.

Of course, a few *jure-divino* Episcopalians, and men of sectarian and puritanic notions, may be found as witnesses for a divine specific form of church government. But men of broad and evangelical views very seldom so testify. And is it not surprising that those who contend that such a divine form is prescribed in the word of God differ so widely as to what that form

is? And, further, instead of differing upon minor points the antagonists stand at the opposite poles of this controversy. At the one extreme stands the rigid Episcopalian, contending for *jure-divino* episcopacy, and at the other stands a free Congregationalist, contending for pure democracy, and each pleading that his form of polity is the only one that is divinely prescribed.

We will here give the judgment of Wesley more fully upon this point, as taken from various periods in his life. The reader will see that very early he was disposed to liberal views upon this subject. In 1745, at the age of forty-two, he and the Wesleyan Conference asked the following questions: "Is episcopal, presbyterian, or independent church government most agreeable to reason?" The answer given was that each is a development of the other. "A preacher preaches and forms an independent congregation; he then forms another and another, in the immediate vicinity of the first; this obliges him to appoint deacons who look on the first pastor as their common father; and as these congregations increase, and as their deacons grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons or helpers; in respect of whom they are called presbyters or elders; as their father in the Lord may be called bishop or overseer of them all."—*Tyerman*, vol. i, p. 499. This shows not his high-church, but liberal, views of church government; and this was passed in the second Wesleyan Conference.

So early and so liberal were the expressed views of Wesley and his preachers.

During the next year (1746) Wesley read Lord King's "Account of the Constitution of the Primitive Church." The change produced in Wesley's mind upon church polity was not, as we think, so great as has been supposed. His liberal views entertained the year before he had read Lord King we have just stated. The reading of that book did not, of itself, suddenly change him from a sturdy high-Churchman to a liberal Dissenter. His views as to the proper origin and nature of church government and episcopacy were all clearly expressed the year before. That book seems to have changed his mind only upon two points: first, the original and essential identity of presbyters and elders; and, second, the undoubted right of presbyters to ordain in certain contingencies, not in all cases. These things show the openness and candor of his mind. He was ready to receive the truth whenever and by whomsoever presented.

But, bearing more directly upon the point before us, he and the Wesleyan Conference of the year succeeding (1747) adopted the following: "Why is it that there is no determinate plan of church government appointed in Scripture? Without doubt because the wisdom of God had regard to this necessary variety. Was there any thought of uniformity in the government of all Churches until the time of Constantine? It is certain there was not, and would not

have been then, had men consulted the word of God only."—*Tyerman*, vol. i, p. 509.

Could any thing be more explicit as to the judgment of Wesley and his preachers upon this point? They declare that there is no determinate plan of church government appointed in the word of God; that there was no thought of uniformity of polity until Constantine. And there is no doubt Wesley was fully competent to decide this question, as he was likely, already preparing himself for publishing his work on church polity, which he did some time after. But still, to show his liberal views of church government, we refer to the year 1756, when he wrote: "Concerning diocesan episcopacy there are several questions I should be glad to have answered: Where is it prescribed in Scripture? How does it appear that the apostles settled it in all the churches they planted? How does it appear that they settled it in any so as to make it of perpetual obligation? It is allowed Christ and his apostles did put the Churches under some form of government or other, but did they put all Churches under the same precise form? If they did, can we prove this to have been the very same which now remains in the Church of England?" —*Tyerman*, vol. ii, p. 257.

These questions, though asked over a hundred years ago, have never been answered. They cannot be answered either by *jure-divino* Episcopalians on the one hand, or by ecclesiastical democrats on the

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY LIBRARY

other. They are absolutely unanswerable. They unmistakably set forth, although in the form of questions, Wesley's position upon church government. And the general principle which we deduce from these questions, as applicable to the point under consideration, is that of the variable form of government of different Churches during the apostolic age.

To show the continued liberality of Wesley's views, when the Methodist Episcopal Church in America was to be organized, in 1784, after suggesting the plan of its government, he prepared the following as a portion of one of its Articles of Faith: "It is not necessary that rites and ceremonies should in all places be the same or exactly alike, for they have been always different, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times, and men's manners, so that nothing be ordained against God's word." And this has remained verbally intact to this day in the Discipline of the Church as a symbol of its liberal views of church polity.

The above theory of church polity is the original and true Protestant doctrine. "Melanchthon and the earliest reformers viewed with veneration the hierarchy which had so long subsisted, as also many of the ceremonies which for ages had been observed; and they expressed their readiness to continue that distinction of pastors which their researches into the history of the Church had enabled them to trace back to the early ages of Christianity. But while they de-

clared in favor of this form of ecclesiastical polity they did so not upon the ground that it was of divine institution, or positively required by the Author of Christianity as inseparable from a Church; but on the ground that, taking into estimation every thing connected with it, it appeared to them eminently adapted to carry into effect that renovation of piety and that religious influence which they were so eager to promote. They thus made ecclesiastical polity a matter of expediency, or of prudential regulation; the one thing, in their view, binding upon all Christians being to strengthen the practical power of religion." —WATSON'S *Bib. and Theol. Dic.*, p. 324. This is confirmed by reference to that great master-symbol of Protestantism, the Augsburg Confession. "It is quite plain from these passages that the framers of that Confession, and those who adhered to it as the standard of their faith, viewed ecclesiastical polity as a matter of human appointment; and that, although they venerated that form of it which had long existed, they looked upon themselves as at liberty, under peculiar circumstances, to depart from it. The truth, accordingly, is, that a great part of the Lutheran Churches . . . did introduce many deviations from that model for which their founders had expressed respect and admiration, although episcopacy was in several places continued." Calvin was the first one to break with this Confession on this point. He swung off to the opposite extreme, as is often the

case, and adopted and defended a theory well-nigh as exclusive and dogmatic as was his doctrine of the atonement of Christ. He zealously contended that the apostolic Church authorized but one class of ministers, and that they were all equal. But his views became modified after a more thorough investigation; for in his "Institutes," when tracing the rise of episcopacy, he says that those to whom the office of teaching was assigned were denominated presbyters; that to avoid the dissensions often arising among equals they chose one of their number to preside, to whom the title of bishop was exclusively given, and that the practice, as the ancients admitted, was introduced by human consent from the necessity of the times. (*Institutes*, book iv, chap. iv.) This is true and liberal.

Finally, Watson says (*Dictionary*, p. 326) that, while they differed on some minor points, they all "agreed in admitting there was no model prescribed in the New Testament for a Christian Church, as there had been in the Mosaical economy for the Jewish Church; and that it was a branch of the liberty of the disciples of Christ, or one of their privileges, to choose the polity which seemed to them best adapted for extending the power and influence of religion."

CHAPTER II.

The Origin of Episcopacy: Prelatical and Erroneous Opinions.

ALL the various theories upon this complex subject may be possibly arranged under three heads. "Theories," we say, for, after all, there is no positive and invariable declaration to be found either in the Scripture record or traditional history. And these three opinions are not clearly distinct, but will often be found interlacing each other.

We will first state, as nearly as we can, the Roman Catholic doctrine. According to this, when Jesus Christ was on earth he was the supreme earthly governor of the Church. He chose twelve men who, by pre-eminent distinction, were called apostles. Christ, in view of his approaching death, and intending to continue the earthly headship of the Church, bestowed upon Peter the primary, or chief and universal, governorship, both as to doctrine and jurisdiction. From Peter, who is supposed to have died while in occupation of the apostolic see at Rome, has descended an unbroken line of successors, possessing equal powers with himself. Hence was the apostolic Church episcopal, Christ himself having been the first and great apostle or pope. Now, it is stating no new thing to say that this stronghold, especially

since the Reformation, has been stormed from every quarter, and that its antiquated bulwarks are now rapidly breaking down under the mighty power of the superior enginery of truth and justice. We need here only state a few of the unanswerable objections made to this theory. Let us, then, state first what were the powers and prerogatives of the apostles.

1. It was necessary that they should have seen the Lord after his resurrection, that they might be competent witnesses before the world. Neither Matthias nor Paul form an exception to this statement, since the former was undoubtedly present on various occasions when Jesus appeared to his disciples after that event, and the latter says that Jesus was seen of him "as of one born out of due time," and the facts of the Gospel history he had not received from man, "but by the revelation of Jesus Christ."

2. An apostle must have been called and commissioned directly by Christ for that especial office. Hence they usually say "called to be an apostle," and Matthias was called from being a disciple to the apostleship made vacant by the treachery and apostasy of Judas, by the divine appointment of the lot.

3. Infallible inspiration was another essentiality of an apostle. No other idea is consonant with the mission of an apostle. The Saviour had promised them the Spirit, which should guide them "into all truth."

4. Another endowment essential to the apostleship

was the power of working miracles. These miraculous signs should be the credentials of their divine mission; and not only so, but particularly of the *apostolicity* of their mission. Hence says Paul: "Truly the signs of an apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds."

5. To these essential characteristics of an apostle may be added the universality of his mission. He had no special charge or congregation. He had the "care of all the Churches." He delivered unerringly to the people the religious creed to which they were called to subscribe. In a word, he was, not in one place, but every-where, the primary *fons et origo* of doctrine and discipline. Now then, in a pre-eminent and exclusive sense, these persons thus empowered are called, both in Scripture and tradition, the twelve apostles; and in the sense of equal endowment they have had no successors. All true ministers of the Gospel are, in a certain, but certainly inferior, sense the successors of the apostles. But it is repugnant to the sense of this age to call any minister, however spiritually or intellectually endowed, in an equal sense an apostle. The intelligence and piety of this age would speak of it as an unlawful assumption, not to say sacrilegious, for any person to claim that he possessed any *one*, much less *all*, of the above essential requisites of an apostle.

It is also evident that the chief of these essentials

was not transmissible. The most important of all was, that the person was a witness to the resurrection of Christ—that he must have seen Christ after his resurrection. This Peter particularly refers to when the two men were proposed, one of which was to succeed Judas in the apostleship. Paul also refers to this especially as proof of his authority as an apostle. The knowledge of a witness is not transferable. And if we were to admit that all the other powers of an apostle were transmissible, yet this one not being so, any successor to the apostleship would lack its first and most important quality, and, lacking this, could not be entitled to the name or office.

The title apostle is not applied in Scripture, in its stricter sense of denoting the higher class of ministers, to any but the twelve, and Matthias, and Paul, and Jesus Christ. There is no question about the last; and as it regards Paul he did not receive either the name or office by succession, but directly from Christ himself after his ascension; and even now, if any man could furnish as clear proof of his apostleship as Paul did he should be entitled to the name. But it is evident no such proof can be given.

Now, if any besides those named were entitled to this office, the immediate successors of the apostles, it would seem, would be so entitled. By prelatists generally it is supposed that Epaphroditus, Titus, and Timothy were ordained by the apostles to be their

immediate and equal successors. But no one of these is called by the apostles themselves, or any of the Scripture writers, in this higher sense, an apostle. Says the learned scholar and high-Churchman, Alford, dean of Canterbury: "*Apostolon, not in the ordinary sense of apostle,* but *minister* (in supply) of my wants." This shows the opinion of that eminent biblical scholar, that no one in New Testament history, and much less since, was entitled to the designation of an apostle in its true sense, but those spoken of by the English translators. And prelatists should be the last ones to quarrel with our present translation.

But the apostolic office in its essential character was personal and temporary. It cannot be proved that any one of them constituted or ordained any one to be a successor *as an apostle.* No intimation of such an ordination can be found in the Scripture record. It is admitted by Romanists themselves that no one of them had an equal and proper successor to the apostleship but Peter. This gives up eleven twelfths of the argument. And, without referring to the unsatisfactoriness of mutilated and partial church history upon this point, we have shown that the essential characteristics of an apostle were not transmissible by any apostle, even Peter himself. Says Neander: "In the apostolical Church there was one office which bears no resemblance to any other, and to which none can be made to conform. This is the office of the

apostle. . . . Their authority and power can be delegated to no other." Says Coleman, from the introduction of whose work on the apostolic Church the above quotation is taken: "The office of the apostles by these limitations ends with themselves. They can have no successors." Dr. Barrow, an Episcopalian, says: "The apostolic office, as such, was personal and temporary, and, therefore, according to its nature and design not successive or communicable to others in perpetual descendance from them. . . . Neither did the apostles pretend to communicate it." Says Dr. George Campbell: "No one on the death of an apostle (except Matthias, and that not for succession) was ever substituted in his room; and when that original sacred college was extinct the title became extinct with it."

In those early times the title apostle was, doubtless, occasionally applied, as it is now, indeed, to some peculiarly venerable and eminent minister, (Eusebius calls Polycarp an apostolical man,) but as now, so then, not in the original and proper sense of the term. Hence, say Conybeare and Howson: "This title was probably at first confined to 'the twelve' who were immediately nominated to their office by the Lord himself." Exceptions are noted, as in the cases of Matthias and Paul. They say further: "In a lower sense the term was applied to all the most eminent Christian teachers, as, for example, Andronicus and Junius. Still those only were called emphatically

the apostles who had received their commission from Christ, including Matthias and Paul." Says Dr. Schaff: "As the Lord himself called only twelve, and promised them that they should hereafter sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; so also the last book of the Bible knows of but 'twelve apostles of the Lamb, whose names are written on the twelve foundations of the heavenly Jerusalem.' Under these aspects their office is intransmissible. Accordingly, we find that the number was not replenished after the death of any one, as James, for instance; and during the last ten years of the first century John was the only surviving member of the original college."

It is just to state here, however, that in the Roman Church there are two theories concerning the episcopate: the papal or ultramontane theory, based upon the primacy of the pope as the only *jure divino* successor of Peter, and through whom the bishops derive their divine right. The second theory is, what is now known as advocated by the "Old Catholics" or Liberals, who claim that the bishops are the equal and co-ordinate successors, not of Peter more than of Paul, and that with respect to the pope, he is but *primus inter pares*, appointed, not divinely, but by themselves, in order to represent and perpetuate the unity of the Church. These two theories, therefore, represent the high-church and low-church parties of that religious body. The former we have considered as the general

Romish theory, and the latter will be considered as properly coming under the high-Episcopalian theory, which will next be duly investigated.

Concerning the origin of episcopacy, as among Romanists so among Episcopalians, there are two theories, called the high-church and the low-church. The "Old Catholics" or Liberals in the Roman Catholic Church are mainly the same in theory upon this point as the high-church advocates in the Episcopal Churches.

The low-church theory among the latter will be considered in connection with the next division. What is the high-church Episcopalian view of the origin of episcopacy? In as few words as we can state it, it is as follows. We quote from the preface to the "Ordinal," used by the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States: It is "evident unto all men, diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." These three orders they suppose to have existed in the apostolic Church, at first under the titles of apostles, presbyters, and deacons. These terms denote three permanent and divinely appointed orders of ministers, without which there cannot be a true Christian Church. It is further held by them that after Christ the apostles were the only source of ministerial authority, ecclesiastical doctrine, and of dis-

cipline; so much so that any Church that has not received these by regular and unbroken succession from the apostles is not a true Church. This primal source of power, polity, and discipline has had successive and perpetual representatives to this day. Through personal deference to the high and holy character of the apostles their successors were called bishops; and, perhaps to avoid confusion, arising from the fact that presbyters were frequently called bishops also, their successors were called priests. No apparent necessity occurring for any substitution, the title deacon was allowed to remain.

It is thought by prelatists, also, that the Apostle Paul ordained Epaphroditus, Titus, and Timothy to be his successors, under the title of bishops. And while they contend that the other apostles did the same, yet they admit the proof of it lies outside of the New Testament. Hence they hold with great tenacity to these supposed ordinations of Paul, and have used their very best logical material and exegetical skill to make good this first link in the succeeding chain. But that they have repeatedly and hopelessly failed is not only the firm persuasion of by far the greater portion of the Protestant world from the Reformation until now, but by a large, intelligent, and rapidly increasing number in their own communions. Apostolic succession, as thus taught, is a failure

1. No question in all the wide range of polemics has been more clearly settled than the scriptural

identity of person and power of presbyter and bishop. The frequent interchange of the titles, and the sameness of personal qualifications and official duties, undoubtedly establish the sameness of office or order.

2. But the advocates for the apostolic origin of episcopacy, abandoning the idea that the word bishop is used in Scripture in their sense, next make a stand upon the assumption that Paul ordained Epaphroditus, Timothy, and Titus bishops, in their sense, of a third and permanent order. But, unfortunately for their cause, neither one of these is called a bishop in the New Testament. We read of bishops and deacons, and of elders and deacons; but nowhere read of the formula bishops, priests, and deacons. Nay, more: is not this very omission, itself evidently intentional, rather a strong presumptive proof that they were not bishops?

But knowing that they cannot find a bishop of the third order, nor his diocese, mentioned in Scripture, they apply to the Fathers to extricate them from their difficulty. They assure us, with great confidence, that they all testify to the fact that Epaphroditus was an apostle to the Philippians, and that Timothy and Titus were ordained bishops by Paul, the former having a large diocese, with his headquarters at Ephesus, and the latter being located at Crete. Now, whatever the Fathers may say, it is certain from the inspired record that neither Epaphroditus nor Titus became diocesan or prelatical bishops while

the apostle lived. We admit the rise of episcopacy after the death of the apostles, but we deny that Paul ordained them prelatical bishops to be his successors. If this had been done, and could be proved by the New Testament, then we could make out the formula of bishops, elders or priests, and deacons, aside from the apostle. And we may modestly say that we have the Scriptures also, as well as the Fathers, and can read them both in the original and vernacular; and we believe that it is not egotism to say that through development of biblical criticism—a matter almost wholly unknown to them—we are in this day equally as well, if, indeed, not better, qualified to correctly interpret the inspired word. But they agree with us in this point, that bishop, presbyter, and elder were, during the apostolic period, synonymous terms. Besides, if those bishops or presbyters were diocesan bishops, such use of the term directly contradicts prelatical episcopacy, which teaches there can be but one bishop for a diocese. Now, then, we doubt not that this equality among the bishops or elders of the congregation would naturally cease in time. Some one of them, because of superior talents and efficiency, would gradually and justly rise above the others, and would be preferred to the others, and, from choice or election by the other presbyters, and perhaps the congregation, would become the regular teacher or pastor of the Church, not unlike the chief ruler of the synagogue. And as the Jewish Christian Churches

became more and more Greek, both in nationality and language, Jewish terms and customs became obsolete, and the Greek or Gentile came into use. Hence the word bishop, being a Greek word, more generally known among the Gentile Greeks than presbyter or elder, was the term chosen by them by which to designate this chosen pastor of the congregation. And the propriety of choosing this word above the others may be seen in the meaning of the word itself, (overseer,) which Conybeare and Howson say, "implies the *duties* of the office." This matter of choosing one of the presbyters to become the regular pastor of the congregation did not take away any right enjoyed by these presbyters, nor did it confer a higher ministerial order upon the pastor. They all had still equal rights of teaching and authority, and the pastor was but *primus inter pares*. They never thought of placing him in a higher ministerial order.

Now, then, coming directly to the point to which we have been thus far gradually arriving, we think it clear that during the apostolic period, and for some time after, a bishop was but the pastor of a single Church. Lord King has not only unanswerably proved from the Fathers, (p. 27,) "that there was but one supreme bishop in a place, the bishop by way of eminence and propriety, the proper pastor and minister of his parish to whose care and trust the souls of that church or parish over which he presided were principally and more immediately committed." He equally

proves also "that there was but one Church to a bishop." (P. 30.) With these things also accords Mosheim, who says, (vol. i, p. 39:) "A bishop during the first and second century was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which at that time was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house."

It is undoubtedly true that Mosheim extends the time too far, as we shall see that episcopacy, at least in the form of some kind of superintendence, existed during at least the latter part of the second century. But the main fact of his statement is true. Says Clarkson, (*Primitive Episcopacy*, p. 182:) "A bishop in the best ages of Christianity was no other than the pastor of a single Church." And Archbishop Cranmer, who is styled the founder of the Church of England, says, (WATSON, *Bib. Dic.*, p. 350:) "The bishops and priests were at one time, and were not two things, but both one office, in the beginning of Christ's religion." What, then, does it matter if Eusebius and other of the fathers do speak of Timothy as bishop of the Church at Ephesus, and Titus as bishop of the Church at Crete. According to the above eminent testimony, which could be augmented almost *ad infinitum*, they were simply the pastors of those congregations, and not diocesan bishops.

But do these writers positively say and clearly prove that they were appointed, even as pastors, regular and permanent, of those Churches? It is a fact

worthy of note that not a single writer during the first three centuries even alludes to a rumor, much less makes a statement, that they were the bishops, in any sense, of those Churches. Eusebius, who wrote in the fourth century, after episcopacy was clearly established, is the first to call them bishops. And he does not refer to these Churches, or any others, as having been in the charge of Timothy and Titus as a matter even then generally and clearly understood, or as even certainly believed by himself. In book iii, 4, he says, what our confident friends should not overlook: "But how many, and which of these, actuated by a genuine zeal, were judged suitable to feed the Churches established by these apostles, it is not easy to say, any further than may be gathered from the writings of Paul." Now, do the writings of Paul prove that they were appointed even as permanent pastors, much less diocesan bishops of Ephesus and Crete? Eusebius does not say so; and we affirm that no one can prove it. Dr. Whitby, of the Church of England, in his preface to his "Commentary on Titus," says, he "was only left in Crete to ordain elders in every city, and to set in order the things that were wanting, and, that having done that work, he had done all that was assigned him in that station, and therefore St. Paul sends for him the very same year to Nicopolis." And as to Timothy, the same author says: "There is no satisfactory evidence of his having resided longer at Ephesus than was neces-

sary to execute a special and temporary mission to the Church of this place." The same writer makes this general remark, that he could find "nothing in any writer of the first three centuries concerning the episcopate of Timothy and Titus, nor any intimation that they bore the name of bishop." Says Dean Alford in his remarks upon the Epistles of Timothy and Titus: "There is not the slightest trace of episcopal government in the present sense of the term."

The word *episcopate* is *paroikias* in the Greek, which literally means a dwelling by, or a temporary residence; and ecclesiastically it means a parish or a single congregation, and not a diocese or a number of Churches or congregations. Hence, if they were the bishops of those Churches they were but pastors of single congregations. All the above is clearly confirmed by Lord King, who says, (pp. 30, 31:) "As for the word *diocese*, by which the bishop's flock is now usually expressed, I do not remember that ever I found it used in this sense by any of the ancients; but there is another word, still retained by us, by which they frequently denominate the bishop's cure, and that is *parish;* so in the synodical epistle of Irenæus to Pope Victor the bishoprics of Asia are twice called parishes. And in Eusebius's "Ecclesiastical History" the word is so applied in several hundred places. It is usual there to read of the bishops of the parish of Alexandria, of the parish of Ephesus, of the parish of Corinth, of the parish of

Athens, of the parish of Carthage; and so of the bishops of the parishes of several other Churches; by that term denoting the very same that we now call a parish; a competent number of Christians dwelling near together, having one bishop, or pastor, or minister, set over them, with whom they all meet at one time to worship and serve God." Hence, if Timothy were bishop of Ephesus, and Titus bishop of Crete, and Mark bishop of Alexandria, and Linus bishop of Rome, and Euodius bishop of Antioch immediately after the death of the apostles, or even before, and even supposing that they had received these appointments from the apostles, it only proves that they were simply pastors of single congregations, and not high-church bishops with dioceses. High-church episcopacy, then, is not to be found in the New Testament, or in the writings of the earliest Fathers, when properly interpreted and understood.

CHAPTER III.

The Origin of Episcopacy: Liberal and True Doctrine.

THE question of episcopacy is to-day the main question in church polity. It must be patiently discussed. It is admitted that there was a class of ministers coexistent with and immediately after the apostles whose sphere of labor, like that of the apostles, was not described, and who also exercised somewhat similar powers. They were called evangelists. The bishops of the early Church were a distinct class from the evangelists. A bishop might become an evangelist, or an evangelist might become a bishop, but he could not properly be both at the same time. We have proved that the terms bishop and elder were sometimes loosely used in New Testament times, interchangeably; and that afterwards bishop became the adopted title of the regular pastor of a single Church. The office of an evangelist is thus described by Eusebius, (book iii, chap. 37:) "For the most of the disciples at that time, animated with a more ardent love of the divine word, had first fulfilled the Saviour's precept by distributing their substance to the needy. Afterward, leaving their country, they performed the office of evangelists to those who had not yet heard the faith, while,

with a noble ambition to proclaim Christ, they also delivered to them the books of the holy Gospels. After laying the foundation of the faith in foreign parts, as the particular object of their mission, and after appointing others as shepherds of the flocks, and committing to these the care of those that had been recently introduced, they went again to other regions and nations with the grace and co-operation of God." And, says Stillingfleet, (p. 340:) "Such were the evangelists, who were sent sometimes into this country to put the Church in order there, sometimes into another; but wherever they were they acted as evangelists and not as fixed officers. Such were Timothy and Titus, notwithstanding all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any one who will take an impartial survey of the arguments on both sides." Theodoret calls them traveling missionaries. Dodwell, who wrote eight books on episcopacy, calls Timothy and Titus itinerants and evangelists. With this also agrees Schaff, who says, (p. 520,) that "they traveled about freely wherever their services were needed." "The apostles employed them as messengers for various purposes to all points of their vast field." "In short, they were in some sense the vicegerents of the apostles, acting under their direction and by their authority, like the commissioners of a king." Conybeare and Howson teach the same when they say, (vol. i, p. 436:) "The term evangelist is applied to the missionaries who,

like Philip the Hellenist and Timothy, traveled from place to place to bear the glad tidings of Christ to unbelieving nations or individuals." Hence it follows that the apostles were all evangelists, although there were evangelists who were not apostles. With reference to Timothy and Titus Pressensé says, in his "History of the Apostolic Church," (page 349:) "They bear no likeness whatever to bishops governing a diocese; they are missionaries, or, as Paul calls them, evangelists, whose mission it is to direct the first steps of young and inexperienced Churches; they exercise a truly apostolical power wherever that power is necessary. They derive their exceptional authority from an exceptional situation." Says Kitto, (himself an Episcopalian:) "It has been with many a favorite notion that Timothy and Titus exhibit the episcopal type even during the life of Paul; but that is an obvious misconception. . . . That Timothy was an evangelist is distinctly stated, and that he received spiritual gifts; there is, then, no difficulty in accounting for the authority vested in him without imagining him to have been a bishop, which is, in fact, disproved even by the same epistle. That Titus, moreover, had no local attachment to Crete is plain from Titus iii, 12; i, 5, to say nothing of the earlier epistle, (2 Cor.;) nor is it true that the episcopal power developed itself out of wandering evangelists any more than out of the apostles."

But we need not add further authorities. Here

is sufficient, taken from the most eminent writers from the earliest to the present time, clearly proving that the evangelist was an itinerant and temporary officer, and not in any sense an ordained diocesan bishop. He was not the equal of, but subordinate to, the apostle. He was in some sense superior to the ordinary pastor, but did not represent a superior and permanent order of ministers. The evangelists did not ordain any one to succeed them in an equal or like capacity. They were exceptional men for exceptional times. We are willing to allow that the general superintendence exercised by them, after the apostles, may have furnished the suggestion, the plan, the pattern, for the episcopacy of the following ages; but what we deny is, that the episcopal system, as taught by high-Churchmen, is founded in the New Testament, so as to be of exclusive divine right.

The angels of the Seven Churches of Asia are also referred to by Roman Catholics generally, and Episcopalians frequently, as diocesan bishops. On the verge of New Testament history, and yet within its sacred limits, is here supposed another proof of exclusive and *jure-divino* episcopacy. Against such a supposition there are many serious objections, only a few of which will here be given. There is mentioned but one Church for each angel, and but one angel for each Church. There were just as many Churches as angels, and no more. There is

nothing in the scriptural account bearing any resemblance to a diocese of a number of Churches. If it be contended that there were in each of these cities a number of Churches, it must be admitted that the proof, if there is any, lies wholly outside of the inspired record, and if so, so far as the point under consideration is concerned diocesan episcopacy is not to be founded upon the word of God. And so far as the proof outside of the New Testament is concerned, we have elsewhere clearly proved that there was but one Church for a bishop, and no authority for a diocese in the Episcopalian sense in the years immediately following the apostolic age. Neither is there any thing in the peculiar term "angel" to warrant the belief that he was a diocesan bishop. Lord King says, (p. 29:) "The titles of this supreme Church officer are most of them reckoned up in one place by Cyprian, which are, 'bishop, president, pastor, governor, superintendent, and priest.' And this is he which in the Revelation is called the angel of his Church, as Origen thinks, which appellation denotes both his authority and office, his power and duty." John Wesley, in his notes on Revelation, (vol. i, p, 20,) following Bengel, says of the angel of the Church: "In each Church there was one pastor, or ruling minister, to whom all the rest (presbyters and people of that congregation) were subordinate. This pastor, bishop, or overseer, had the peculiar care over that flock."

And while Kitto admits that these angels are a germ of the after episcopacy, he denies that even the germ was of direct and divine appointment, and says, after a careful examination of the word, that it is "almost certain that the 'angels of the Churches' is nothing but a harsh Hebraism for 'ministers of the Churches.'" Rev. Albert Barnes, who has left a work upon the apostolic Church, in his Notes on the Revelation, after a somewhat thorough reference to the Old and New Testament uses of the word, says: "The conclusion, then, to which we have come is that the 'angel of the Church' was the pastor or presiding presbyter in the Church; the minister who had the pastoral charge of it, and who was, therefore, a proper representative of it." This view of the subject, says Stillingfleet, is "far more probable" than any other. Professor Stuart, of Andover, adopting the views of Virtinga, compares the "angel of the Church" to the "ruler of the synagogue," whose duty "was to superintend and conduct the worship of the synagogue." Dr. Delitzsch and Dr. Fürst are the authors of a critical and learned Hebrew concordance. Says the former concerning the angel of the Church: "I have thus shown that the appellation 'angel of the Church' was used to designate the presiding officer of the Christian Church with particular reference to the ruler of the synagogue. Still, as a name of an officer the angel of the Church may have a meaning somewhat higher.

Such a meaning it may have with reference, retrospectively, to the ruler of the synagogue of the Old Testament. So that the angel of the Church may at the same time denote the bishop or presbyter chosen by this Christian community to be the messenger or servant of God and of the Church." We think, therefore, that it is sufficiently clear that the angels of those Churches were the regular pastors of those Churches.*

The authors to which we have referred, while representing various shades of theological and ecclesiastical opinions upon other subjects, are clearly a unit upon this. The most of them are eminent for their profundity in biblical and literary lore. The angel of the Church, then, was not a diocesan bishop, representing a third and permanent order in the ministry, existing by divine appointment and of exclusive right. High-Church episcopacy, therefore, has no footing here.

* Editorial Note.—Is it probable that there was but one worshiping congregation or organized Church in Ephesus so late as when John wrote the Apocalypse? And so of the other of the seven Churches. In Jerusalem in the time of James there were *myriads* of believers. Acts xxi, 20. There were five thousand in the Jerusalem Church of the Pentecost. We think it must be admitted that the various congregations of a city were often collectively called "the Church of" that city. Lord King's positions seem scarce tenable. To the editor the true doctrine seems to be, that in the New Testament there is a class of men indicated who presided over several congregations. But, 1. It cannot be conclusively proved that such was the universal churchly custom; and, 2. No command or explicitly obligatory model is found rendering such an arrangement neces-

Prelatical episcopacy, then, of whatever kind, as we have seen, cannot be educed from the apostolate, nor from the supposition that the apostles ordained Timothy and Titus as diocesan bishops, nor from the fact that they were evangelists, nor from the opinion that the angels of the seven Churches were episcopal bishops in the high-Church sense. Such an episcopacy was not born in the age of inspired history. It was of later development.

sary to the validity of a Church. Wesley and the British Conference, even after Wesley's reading Lord King, declared, in 1747, that the three orders are found in fact in the New Testament:—

"*Q.* Are the three orders, of bishops, priests, and deacons, plainly described in the New Testament?

"*A.* We think they are, and believe they generally obtained in the Churches of the apostolic age.

"*Q.* But are you assured that God designed the same plan should obtain in all Churches in all ages?

"*A.* We are not assured of this, because we do not know it is asserted in the Holy Writ.

"*Q.* If this plan were essential to a Christian Church, what must become of all the foreign reformed Churches?

"*A.* It would follow that they are no parts of the Church of Christ! A consequence full of shocking absurdity.

"*Q.* Must there not be numberless accidental varieties in the government of various Churches?

"*A.* There must, in the nature of things, for, as God variously dispenses his gifts of nature, providence, and grace, both the offices themselves and the officers in each ought to be varied from time to time.

"*Q.* Why is it there is no determinate plan of Church government appointed in Scripture?

"*A.* Without doubt, because the wisdom of God had a regard to this necessary variety."

Providential Origin of Episcopacy.

No formula of church government was given by the Founder of the Church. It was to be a thing of providential development, as the apparent necessity should require. It was to be a development from the Head downward; from the general to the particular, from the most important to the least important. To perform the subordinate labor, which the apostles up to that time had themselves done, but which they could no longer do because of its increase, the helpers or deacons were chosen and appointed. The increase of local pastoral work subsequently suggested the appointment of presbyters. So, doubtless, the occurring necessity suggested the propriety of the appointment of all other church office-bearers. But near the close of the apostolic period, when all the inspired leaders and superintendents had left or were about leaving, we see what was, for the most part, a reversion of this order. Such a change was a providential outgrowth of the pure Church of God. It was no relapse or departure.

The Church now grows up from the particular to the general, from the congregational to the synodical. Out of the local Church come all the church offices and officers, including the presbyters or elders, the regular teachers and rulers of the congregation. Out of these presbyters one who is observed to be

the most efficient is chosen as their regular pastor and president. By the teaching and preaching of these presbyters and pastor neighboring Churches are formed, it being too inconvenient from distance or lack of room for them to meet in one place. The formation of neighboring and kindred Churches suggested a *conference* of these pastors and presbyters to consider important questions concerning doctrine and discipline arising in the local Churches. These occasional conferences finally settle into regular and important meetings, which suggested rules and powers. The president of this conference, chosen, no doubt, at first by seniority, being apostolical in appearance, and following the example of the apostles and evangelists, was given the general oversight of the Churches embraced in that conference, and this general superintendent was finally termed bishop, not from order or ordination, but as the word indicates, because he was the overseer. This, in brief, without reference to time and place, we believe to be the true origin of episcopacy. In support of this doctrine we will first give the testimony of Jerome, who wrote in the fourth century. Commenting on the Epistle to Titus, he says: "A presbyter is the same as a bishop. And before dissensions in religion were produced by the instigation of the devil, and one said, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Cephas, the Churches were governed by a common council of presbyters. Afterward, in order

to destroy the seeds of dissension the whole charge was committed to one. Therefore, as the presbyters know that, according to the custom of the Church, they are subject to the bishop who presides over them, so let the bishops know that their superiority to the presbyters is more from custom than from the appointment of the Lord, and they ought to unite together in the government of the Church." He also says, that "the same was the custom of the Church at Alexandria from the time of Mark the evangelist." The first sentence in this quotation, if true, is destructive of the high-church theory. A prelatical bishop, then, is not found in the New Testament. And the last sentences prove the later but providential necessity as to the origin of episcopacy.

Calvin shall be our next witness: and as Jerome has been supposed to favor prelacy, so Calvin has been supposed to be opposed to all kinds of episcopacy. Neither one is, therefore, supposed to be prejudiced in our favor, but rather against us; but as we found the former testifying in our favor so will we find the latter. He heads the chapter referred to, "The State of the Ancient Church and the Mode of Government Practiced before the Papacy." He says that the rulers of this ancient Church were "so *cautious* in framing their whole economy according to the sole standard of the word of God that in this respect scarcely any thing can be

detected among them inconsistent with that word;" and that while, in some particulars, there may have been some incidental departure, yet "they directed their sincere and zealous efforts to preserve the institution of God without deviating from it to any considerable extent." And again he says: "To guard against dissension, the general consequence of equality, the presbyters in each city chose one of their own number whom they distinguished by the title of bishop. . . . And that this arrangement was introduced by human agreement on account of the necessity of the times is acknowledged by the ancient writers themselves." Still further he says: "Every assembly, as I have stated, for the sole purpose of preserving order and peace, was under the direction of one bishop, who, while he had the precedence of all others in dignity, was himself subject to the assembly of the brethren. If the territory placed under his episcopacy was too extensive to admit of his discharging all the duties of a bishop in every part of it, presbyters were appointed in certain stations to act as his deputies in things of minor importance. These were called country bishops, because in the country they represented the bishop." Here we may discover, according to this eminent author, the origin of true episcopal authority and supervision. Such an episcopacy, according to the same, was not an essential deviation from the word of God.

We will next give the testimony of Dr. Mosheim, who says: "Three or four presbyters, men of remarkable piety and wisdom, ruled these small congregations in perfect harmony; nor did they stand in need of any president or superior to maintain concord and order where no dissensions were known. But the number of the presbyters and deacons increasing with that of the Churches, and the sacred work of the ministry growing more painful and weighty by a number of additional duties, these new circumstances required new regulations. It was then judged necessary that one man of distinguished gravity and wisdom should preside in the council of presbyters, in order to distribute among his colleagues their several tasks, and to be a center of union to the whole society. This person was at first styled the angel of the Church to which he belonged, but was afterward distinguished by the name of bishop or inspector; a name borrowed from the Greek language, and expressing the principal part of the episcopal function, which was to inspect and superintend the affairs of the Church." He continues to say that it is probable that the Church at Jerusalem was, likely, the first to adopt this measure, and that the others by degrees followed this respectable example. He again says: "The power and jurisdiction of the bishops were not long confined to these narrow limits, but were soon extended by the following means: The bishops who lived in

the cities had, either by their own ministry or that of their presbyters, erected new churches in the neighboring towns and villages. These Churches, continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops by whose labors and counsels they had been engaged to embrace the Gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterward called dioceses. But as the bishop of the city could not extend his labors and inspection to all these Churches in the country and in the villages, he appointed certain suffragans or deputies to govern and instruct these new societies, and they were distinguished by the title of country bishops. This order held the middle rank between bishops and presbyters."—*Eccl. Hist.*, vol. i, chap. 2.

We will next refer to Dr. Neander, whose latest and best views upon the government of the primitive Church are found in his "Introduction" to Coleman's "Apostolic Church." Having spoke of the original equality of presbyter and bishop, he remarks: "But in process of time one, in the ordinary course of events, would gradually obtain the pre-eminence over his colleagues, and, by reason of that peculiar oversight which he exercised over the whole community, might come to be designated by the name bishop, which was originally applied to them all indiscriminately. The constant tumults from within and from without which agitated the Church in the times of the apostles may have given to such

a one opportunity to exercise his influence the more efficiently, so that at such a time the controlling influence of one in this capacity may have been very salutary to the Church. This change in the relation of the presbyters to each other was not at the same time in all the Churches, but varied according to their different circumstances. It may have been as early as the latter part of the life of John, when he was sole survivor of the other apostles, that one as president of this body of presbyters was distinguished by the name of bishop. There is, however, no evidence that the apostle introduced this change, much less that he authorized it as a perpetual ordinance for the future. Such an ordinance is in direct opposition to the spirit of that apostle. This change in the mode of administering the government of the Church, resulting from peculiar circumstances, may have been introduced as a salutary expedient, without implying any departure from the purity of the Christian spirit."

Let us next hear what Stillingfleet says, who, while he wrote his great work on church government in his youth, has never been fairly answered. He says, (p. 281 :) "When the apostles were taken out of the way, who kept the main power in their own hands of ruling their several presbyteries, or delegated some to do it who had a main hand in planting Churches with the apostles, and thence are called in Scripture sometimes fellow-laborers in the

Lord, and sometimes evangelists, and by Theodoret apostles, but of a second order—after, I say, these were deceased, and the main power left in the presbyteries, the several presbyters enjoying an equal power among themselves—the wiser and graver sort considered the abuses following the promiscuous use of this power of ordination, and, withal, having in their minds the excellent frame of the government of the Church under the apostles and their deputies —and for the preventing of future schisms and divisions among themselves—they unanimously agreed to choose one out of their number who was best qualified for the management of so great a trust, and to devolve the exercise of the power of ordination and jurisdiction to him, yet so as he do nothing of importance without the consent and concurrence of the presbyters, who were still to be as the common council to the bishop. This I take to be the true and just account of the origin of episcopacy in the primitive Church according to Jerome." As to the origin of episcopacy we have not anywhere seen the whole truth, as we believe, told as here, and that in one sentence. It is told naturally and succinctly, and by an Episcopalian.

Says F. W. Newman in Kitto's "Cyclopædia:" "On the other hand, it would seem that the bishop began to elevate himself (no doubt by his efficiency) above the presbyter while the Apostle John was yet alive, and in Churches to which he is believed

to have peculiarly devoted himself." And speaking of the angels of the seven Churches he says: "We therefore here see a single officer in these rather large Christian communities elevated into a peculiar prominence, which has been justly regarded as episcopal; we find, therefore, the germ of episcopacy here planted as it were under the eyes of an apostle. Nevertheless, it was still but a germ."

The eminent Dr. Rothe, of the University of Bonn, published in 1837 a scholarly work on the "Beginnings of the Christian Church and its Constitution," in which he proves that episcopacy was developed from the congregation, and that "the germs of episcopacy are to be found as early as the close of the first century, and particularly in the sphere of the later labors of St. John." Of this work says Schaff, (p. 119:) "It comes to the conclusion, that the episcopate, as a necessary substitute for the apostolate, in maintaining and promoting unity, reaches back even to the days of St. John, and thus has the apostolic sanction." And says Schaff himself, (p. 540,) after a very thorough inquiry into the rise of episcopacy: "If, now, we consider, in fine, that in the second century the episcopal system existed as an historical fact in the whole Church east and west, and was unresistingly acknowledged, nay, universally regarded as at least indirectly of divine appointment, *we can hardly escape the conclusion, that this form of government naturally grew out of*

the circumstances and wants of the Church at the end of the apostolic period, and could not have been so quickly and so generally introduced without the sanction, or at least the acquiescence, of the surviving apostles, especially of John, who labored on the very threshold of the second century, and left behind him a number of venerable disciples. At all events, it needs a strong infusion of skepticism or of traditional prejudice to enable one, in the face of all these facts and witnesses, to pronounce the episcopal government of the ancient Church a sheer apostasy from the apostolic form and a radical revolution."

This candid and important statement, being made by a man whose fame for erudition fills two hemispheres, goes very far toward settling the question as to the source and nature of primitive episcopacy. The above conclusion has additional force when we remember that it was reached by the careful investigation, not of an Episcopalian of any school, but formerly a Reformed, and now a Presbyterian, divine. And such is his matured judgment. That such is the case we can prove by referring to Lange's "Commentary upon Timothy," in which we find a note by the eminent Episcopal divine, Dr. Washburn, of New York, and which, having been reviewed by Dr. Schaff as general editor, of course goes forth with his sanction. Referring to the change of the equal application of the term presbyter and bishop at the

close of the apostolic period, he says: "The change points naturally to some election of a presbyter by the college as their chief. This sufficiently explains the case, and appears the most probable custom in the early Church." These bishops, then, were made such by election, and not by apostolic appointment. Finally, he remarks: "It is enough to say that toward the close of the lives of St. Paul and St. John *there was a natural historic change of the Church*, as it became settled in its great social centers, from the general rule of the apostolate to a diocesan structure. We see in the cases of Timothy and Titus the germinal form of such an episcopal office. It was a legitimate outgrowth. It had the sanction of the apostles. To say that it was the invention of a later age, an apostasy from primitive purity or democracy, is unhistoric. Such a structural change could not have taken place without conflict; and the very silence of the subapostolic records, the undisputed right with which diocesan episcopacy emerges at the opening of authentic Church history, confirms it as primitive. Yet it is alike unhistoric to rear this fact into a *jus divinum*, or to identify this simple episcopate of the early Church with the type of a later hierarchy." These things he confirms by referring to the works of Rothe, Cureton, Bunsen, Baur, Lepsius, Uhlhorn, and others.

We now quote the well-known opinion of John

Wesley, when he said: "I still believe the episcopal form of church government to be scriptural and apostolical: I mean, well agreeing with the practice and writings of the apostles. But that it is *prescribed* in Scripture I do not believe. This opinion, which I once zealously espoused, I have been heartily ashamed of ever since I read Bishop Stillingfleet's 'Irenicon.' I think he has unanswerably proved that neither Christ nor his apostles prescribe any particular form of church government; and that the plea of divine right for diocesan episcopacy was never heard of in the primitive Church."—*Tyerman*, vol. ii, p. 244.

It will be seen by this that Wesley did not believe that *jure divino* episcopacy was authorized either by Scripture or church history. He did believe, however, that a moderate or superintending episcopacy was in harmony with the teachings and practice of the apostles, and that it was the form of government existing in the primitive Churches. Episcopacy, then, not being divinely enjoined in Scripture, what was Wesley's judgment as to its true origin? This we may learn from an answer to a question asked in the Wesleyan Conference in 1745, which was: "Is episcopal, presbyterian, or independent church government most agreeable to reason? The answer given was, that each is a development of the other. A preacher preaches and forms an independent congregation; he then forms another and another in

the immediate vicinity of the first; this obliges him to appoint deacons, who look on their first pastor as their common father; and as these congregations increase, and as their deacons grow in years and grace, they need other subordinate deacons or helpers; in respect of whom they are called presbyters or elders; as their father in the Lord may be called the bishop or overseer of them all."—*Tyerman*, vol. i, p. 499. This is plain, but truthful. So episcopacy was the natural outgrowth from the individual congregation. This is the process without respect to the time of its origin. And as to the time of its origin, says Whedon, (*Com. Acts*, xi, 30:) "It seems probable that before the Apostle John died the episcopal form was generally prevalent, and probably with his sanction. But it is not clear that the episcopal form was ever divinely enjoined or prescribed as indispensable to a legitimate Church."

We have thus seen the origin of episcopacy both as to time and manner. It originated in the pure post-apostolic Church. There was a natural development from the congregational to the synodical; from the local pastor to the general superintendent or bishop, which officer was chosen by the presbyters from among the presbyters. The government was then finally made episcopal by the election of the presbyters. They may have found the analogy, and even suggestion, of this office in the

apostolate; still the episcopacy was of their own creation. It is, then, hardly correct to say that Methodist episcopacy is *sui generis*. Is it not rather like that of the pure primitive Church? It is true that the American preachers had the suggestion, the recommendation, from John Wesley; but still it was of their own creation or election. It was wholly competent for them to choose what form of government they thought best. True, it would have been unnatural, and even somewhat disrespectful, to Wesley to have chosen any other form of government. The American preachers in the Conference of 1784 by their votes made the form of their church government episcopal. Methodist episcopacy did not, then, come from John Wesley by succession, only by suggestion.*

* But see Wesley's own diploma given to Coke, where he claims to ordain as an "elder," by a providential call. There is, then, an historical and ecclesiastical succession at bottom.—ED.

CHAPTER IV.

How Methodism in Great Britain Failed to become Episcopal: Wesley's Desire and Efforts to Make it Such.

WE have seen that American Methodism, at its organization in 1784, assumed an episcopal form of government, and that it did so in part on the recommendation, and in accordance with the provisions made by John Wesley, concurred in by the American Conference of that year. How was it, then, that English Methodism did not assume a similar form? Not, certainly, because the English Methodists doubted their founder being an *episcopos* in fact, for as early as 1745, when Wesley was but forty-two years of age, the Conference spoke of him as "their father in the Lord," and as the "bishop and overseer of them all."—*Tyerman*, vol. i, p. 499. The English Wesleyan Societies were, too, already episcopal in the form of church government through their connection with the national Church.

2. It is true Wesley thought himself providentially called to ordain a bishop for his American Societies. In his reply to Charles Wesley, who had censured him for ordaining Coke, he said that he believed himself "a scriptural *episcopos* as much as any man in England." Only two years before his death he,

referring to the above statement, wrote: "When I said, 'I believe I am a scriptural bishop,' I spoke on Lord King's supposition that bishops and presbyters are essentially one order."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 572. He could, then, have constituted the English Methodists an episcopal Church by ordaining a successor.

3. It was not because he did not prefer the episcopal mode of church government that he failed to constitute his own Societies into an episcopal body. He did prefer this. He said repeatedly that he believed that form of church government agreed well with the practice of the apostolic Church; that he thinks it (the Church of England) "the best constituted national Church in the world." As a Churchman he was *ex necessitati rei* an Episcopalian in his theory of church government. So, also, the American Conference of 1784 said: "We formed ourselves into an independent Church, following the counsel of Mr. John Wesley, who recommended the episcopal mode of church government."—*Minutes*, 1785. This was written and published about six years before Mr. Wesley's death, and as Wesley was intensely interested in all that related to the American Societies, it is an unreasonable supposition that he did not know of this declaration. He never denied what the American Conference then affirmed. This he would have promptly done, as was his custom. had it been incorrect. Hence Bishops Coke and

Asbury spoke the simple truth when they wrote in their Explanatory Notes to the Discipline in 1796: "The late Rev. John Wesley recommended the episcopal form to his Societies in America. . . . Mr. Wesley therefore preferred the episcopal form of church government." The failure of the British Methodists to become episcopal, then, was not because Wesley did not prefer this mode of church government.

4. Neither was it because he did not, while living, take any initiatory steps toward such an organization. Eighteen years before his death he began to feel deep concern for his Societies in case of his death. Already the prophets of evil were speaking of the speedy termination of his great work as soon as he should die. Wesley began to cast about for a successor. His mind was clearly fixed upon Fletcher as the proper person. He wrote to him saying: "The wise men of the world say, 'When Mr. Wesley drops, then all this is at an end.' And so surely it will, unless before God calls him hence *one is found to stand in his place.* For *ουκ αγαθον πολυκοιρανιη. Εις κοιρανος εζω.** I see more and more unless there be one *προεζως*,† the work can never be carried on. The body of the preachers are not united; nor will any part of them submit to the rest; so that either there

* It is not good that the supreme power should be lodged in many hands. Let there be one chief governor.

† A person who presides over the rest.

must be one to preside over all, or the work will indeed come to an end." He says to Fletcher: "Thou art the man!" Having spoken of his qualifications for the position, he says: "Come out, in the name of God! Come to the help of the Lord against the mighty! Come, while I am alive and capable of labor! Come, while I am able, God assisting, to build you up in faith, to ripen your gifts, and to introduce you to the people! *Nil tanti.*"* He closes his letter by saying: "Without conferring, therefore, with flesh and blood, come and strengthen the hands, comfort the heart, and share the labor, of your affectionate friend and brother." This shows Wesley's intense desire to appoint, while he was living, a general superintendent to be his successor. It is not pertinent to argue the wisdom of this proposed plan. It is simply our design to prove that he did prefer one general superintendent to succeed him, and that he made an effort to accomplish his preference.

It is doubtless true, however, that his choice was a very wise one—much more so than if he had selected his own brother, who proved himself to be by far too rigid a high-Churchman for the liberty of Methodism, as well as lacking in legislative ability. Fletcher, in his reply, called his attention to his brother, and promised in case of his death to do his "best, by the Lord's assistance, to help your brother

* Nothing is of equal moment.

to gather the wreck," and keep the Society together. No doubt he thought if Charles Wesley was not the most suitable, yet he was the most legitimate, successor for his brother. Fletcher shrank from accepting so onerous a responsibility. But Wesley did not yet abandon his hope. Six months after this, and after he had held a private interview with him, he wrote him again upon the same subject. Speaking of the probable benefit of their more frequent interviews, he says: "It might be of great advantage both to ourselves and the people, who may otherwise soon be as sheep without a shepherd. You say, indeed, 'Whenever it pleases God to call me away you will do all you can to help them.' But will it not then be too late? You may then expect grievous wolves to break in on every side, and many to arise from among themselves speaking perverse things. Both the one and the other stand in awe of me, and do not care to encounter me; so that I am able, whether they will or no, to deliver the flock into your hands. But no one else is. And it seems this is the very time when it may be done with the least difficulty. . . . Methinks 'tis a pity we should lose any time; for what a vapor is life!" And although Wesley failed to induce Fletcher to be thus appointed, yet he very reluctantly gave him up, for he afterward wrote concerning this subject: "I can never believe it was the will of God that such a burning and shining light

should be hid under a bushel. No; instead of being confined to a country village it ought to have shone in every corner of our land."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, pp. 146–150.

The above prophecy of Wesley was sadly fulfilled in the six long and anxious years of tribulation and division that followed his death. It was his fervent desire to prevent this by appointing a general superintendent as his successor, which would have virtually made British Methodism perpetually episcopal.

But failing in appointing Fletcher, he finally, only two years before his death, found a worthy successor in the person of Alexander Mather. He was a Scotchman by birth and a Presbyterian by early education, but became "one of the most notable heroes of Methodism in the last century." He had more bravery, but perhaps less learning, than Fletcher. "He feared the face of no man, but would resolutely go forward with his work in the name and in the strength of the Lord God." Tyerman says, (vol. iii, p. 441,) that at the Conference of 1789 Wesley "ordained him to the office not only of deacon and elder, but of superintendent." And Mr. Pawson, the intimate friend of Mather, says that Wesley "ordained Mr. Mather and Dr. Coke bishops. *These he undoubtedly designed should ordain others.* Mr. Mather told us so at the Manchester Conference, (1791, the first after Wesley's death,) but we

did not then understand. . . . I sincerely wish that Dr. Coke and Mr. Mather may be allowed to be *what they are—bishops.*"—STEVENS'S *Methodism*, vol. iii, p. 51. And says a competent historian, referring to ample authority, "Wesley ordained him with his own hands, and made him a superintendent or bishop of his societies."—STEVENS'S *Methodism*, vol. ii, p. 147. British Methodism, then, did not fail to become episcopal because Wesley did not design it should be, nor because he did not take the initial steps to make it so.

5. Finally, the failure was not owing to any want of belief in or preference for episcopacy on the part of many of the most eminent preachers that composed the first conferences after Wesley's death.

We have already spoken of Alexander Mather. As we shall soon see he advocated an "*order* of superintendents," besides elders and deacons, as a legitimate and proper way of adjusting the difficulties in which Wesley's Societies were then involved. This he regarded as their right and duty in settling the form of polity after Wesley's death.

We have also alluded to Mr. Pawson, who was chosen president of the Conference the year following. "No name is more saintly than his in the memory of early Methodists." During the trials which followed Wesley's death he was one of the pillars of the shaken structure of Methodism, and few men did more to give it steadfastness in this

perilous period. Speaking of episcopal and presbyterian forms of government he said: "Our preachers and people in general are prejudiced against the latter; consequently, if the former will answer our end we ought to embrace it. Indeed, I believe it will suit our present plan far better than the other. The design of Mr. Wesley will weigh much with many, which now evidently appears to have been this: He foresaw that the Methodists would, after his death, soon become a distinct people; he was deeply prejudiced against a presbyterian, and as much in favor of an episcopal, form of government; in order, therefore, to preserve all that was valuable in the Church of England among the Methodists he ordained Mr. Mather and Dr. Coke bishops. These he undoubtedly designed should ordain others. . . . I sincerely wish that Dr. Coke and Mr. Mather may be allowed to be what they are, *bishops*."—STEVENS'S *Methodism*, vol. iii, p. 51. Had, then, the judgment of this great man been heeded as to the design of Wesley, British Methodism would have become episcopal after the plan of American Methodism. And, further, says the same historian: "Some of the most commanding members of the Conference concurred with him, and received his suggestion as the most likely solution of their formidable difficulties."

Dr. Coke returned to England on the death of Wesley. That Conference did not look upon him with such suspicion as some late writers have. As a body

it did not think him an ambitious clerical aspirant, as some of his inferiors have since called him. A few may have been suspicious of his return just at that particular time. But how the Conference looked upon him may be seen from the fact that it immediately elected him to its second place of honor, secretary. He was re-elected to this honorable position every conference following for six years, and at the seventh conference was chosen its president. These things show how highly he was esteemed by the British Conference. Of course, from the important part which he took in organizing the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States six years previously he would be considered in favor of an episcopal organization for the British Conference. Hence, in 1808, eleven years after the settlement of the polity of the British Conference, he wrote: "I believe that the episcopal form of church government is the best in the world when the episcopal power is under due regulations and responsibility."—*Defense of Our Fathers*, p. 152.

After three years of fruitless effort to settle the form of government, Mather, Taylor, Pawson, Bradburn, Rogers, Moore, Adam Clarke, and Dr. Coke signed and recommended and supported a series of resolutions in the Conference of 1794 providing for deacons, elders, and "an order of superintendents" as "a thing greatly wanted, and likely to be of much advantage to the work of God."—STEVENS'S *Meth-*

odism, vol. iii, pp. 52, 53. This was evidently and mainly in accordance with the ritual which Wesley had sent to America ten years previous, which was the suggestive plan by the adoption of which American Methodism became episcopal. This same plan was thus advocated by many of the most learned and pious of the British Conference. They were, doubtless, of the same opinion of that eminent president of their Conference, Dr. Dixon, who said: "If we mistake not, it is to the American Methodist Episcopal Church that we are to look for the real mind and sentiments of this great man."—*Methodism in its Origin*, p. 248. And these men knew that that form of government which had been suggested by Wesley to the American Methodists he had also in the main provided for the British Methodists. In 1788, four years after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, and three years before his death, he prepared a ritual for the British Methodists. And we have reason to believe that these rituals were essentially the same as far as they could be so in different countries and under different governments. The titles of these books were precisely the same, except the name of the country for which they were intended, namely, "The Sunday Service of the Methodists; with other Occasional Services." The preface to each book is substantially the same. In each one he says of the changes he had made in the book from the Liturgy

of the Church of England: "Little alteration is made except in the following instances: most of the holy days are omitted, the service of the Lord's day is considerably shortened; some sentences in the offices of baptism and for the burial of the dead are omitted; many Psalms and parts of Psalms are left out."—*Defense of Our Fathers*, pp. 60–68. So far the prefaces are identical.

But he made other changes than those enumerated here. The half popish canticle, *Benedicite omnia opera*, is omitted. The word minister or elder is used for the objectionable word priest: in baptism he dispensed with "the signing of the cross," the order of "confirmation," and all reference to "godfathers" and "godmothers;" and the order for "the visitation of the sick," and the semi-popish "absolution," are all omitted. And, says Tyerman, (vol. iii, p. 548:) "In lieu of three forms for ordaining deacons, priests, and bishops, Wesley gives three for ordaining superintendents, elders, and deacons." This is precisely the same as the Ritual for the American Methodists. And they said that, following the preferences and counsel of Wesley, they adopted the episcopal mode of government. And in adopting this mode Wesley had never said nor intimated that they had not followed his counsel. Hence, those eminent men referred to, in recommending an order of superintendents, besides elders and deacons, were not only following the American,

but the British, Ritual, which we have found to have been substantially the same in every respect, and exactly the same in the form of government suggested therein. If the one was according to the counsel of Wesley, so the other would have been. And at least the recommendation of those ministers to that Conference of that plan for an "order of superintendents" was according to the Ritual which Wesley had prepared only three years before his death for their use. And had they followed that Ritual in this respect the government would have undoubtedly become moderately yet truly episcopal in form. Therefore, considering the foregoing facts, it seems, at first, surpassingly strange that the British Conference, after the death of their father and founder, should at last have failed to adopt the episcopal mode of church government, and in its stead chosen the presbyterian form in substance; that very form against which their venerated founder was so deeply prejudiced.

CHAPTER V.

Dilemma of British Methodism.

WE have seen that during the life of Wesley his Societies were really under episcopal control of the primitive kind, Wesley being, *de facto*, their *episcopos*. Also, that he greatly desired, and diligently strove to find, one to whom to transfer his own authority; and that he made provision in the Ritual for the three classes of officers, bishops, presbyters, and deacons. Furthermore, that he really ordained Mather a superintendent, and that many of the ablest preachers of the English Conference, after his death, strove to make the government of his Societies episcopal. But in this he failed. Let us find, if we can, why he failed.

In our inquiries we shall confine ourselves to the chief causes which brought about the result.

1. First was his failure in 1773 to secure Mr. Fletcher's consent to assume the position. This was his fullest attempt to provide for the unity and perpetuity of his Societies in case of his death. This plan may, then, be regarded as his clearest and best choice. It is admitted on all hands that Wesley exercised truly episcopal power and authority, and a successor was evidently designed to perpetuate

these personal prerogatives. Had Mr. Fletcher then accepted the office as assistant to Mr. Wesley, the people would have soon become accustomed to his exercise of its duties, and when he died would have readily received from Mr. Wesley any other person he might have designated to fill the vacancy thus occasioned. And thus, the office being established, the serious troubles which then ensued would have been avoided, and the form of church government settled.

2. Failing to secure Fletcher as his successor, and feeling the imperative duty of making some provision for the preservation of these Societies after his death, Wesley at the Conference of 1773 revived and presented a plan which he had read in the Conference of 1769. It is evident, however, that that plan was not quite satisfactory, even to himself. He had had no misgivings about the proposition he made to Fletcher; but he had about this one, as the document itself will prove. He says: "But what method can be taken to preserve a firm union between those who choose to remain together? Perhaps you might take some such steps as these: On notice of my death, let all the preachers in England and Ireland repair to London within six weeks. . . . Let them choose by votes a committee of three, five, or seven, each of whom is to be moderator in his turn. Let the committee do what I do now: propose preachers to be tried, admitted, or excluded;

fix the place of each preacher for the ensuing year, and the time of next Conference." There is nothing said in the document about ordination or the sacraments, the chief difficulties of after years. This plan, Stevens says, (*Methodism*, vol. i, p. 442,) "was held in suspense by Wesley during several years." This plan was again brought forward in 1774 and 1775, after which, so far as we know, it was never presented for signatures. From the first it was not popular with the preachers. The highest number of signers it ever reached was eighty, when there were one hundred and fifty-two appointed to fields of labor. It does not seem to have been signed by any one at the time it was first read to the Conference, (1769.) It was simply ordered to be printed in the Minutes, and a copy sent "to each itinerant to be seriously considered."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 30. Nothing was therefore as yet accomplished respecting the form of the government in case of his death. He had failed to prepare the way for, or to continue, the episcopal organization of the Societies.

3. Almost from the first Wesley had trouble with the trustees of the church property. Some of them desired to have the power of absolute ownership and the undisputed control of the appointments to their pulpits. "At an early period in his history (1750) Wesley published a model deed for the settlement of chapels, to this effect, that the trustees for the time being should permit Wesley himself,

and such other persons as he might from time to time appoint, to have the free use of such premises to preach therein God's holy word. In case of his death, the same right was secured to his brother; and providing that his brother's decease occurred before that of William Grimshaw, the same prerogatives were to belong to the last-mentioned. After the death of the three clergymen the chapels were to be held in trust for the sole use of such persons as might be appointed at the yearly Conference of the people called Methodists."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 417.

Although there were attempts more or less successful, at times, to vary from this, yet this was the model deed up to the year 1784. In this deed Wesley provided for two successors to himself. And this was, doubtless, as far as he felt justified in planning for the future. Evidently he intended such a line to continue, which would have secured a general superintendency or episcopacy. This plan designated the appointment of the preachers at the session of the Conference, as was Wesley's custom. It did not provide for their appointment by the Conference. He intended, no doubt, that the appointing power should continue where it had been, centered in one individual, aided by the counsel of wise and good men. But this plan, so far as it prescribed the form of government of the connection in the future, was destined also to fail. Grimshaw had died in

1762, and Wesley mourned his death as he did the death of few men. His brother Charles, besides having proved himself unworthy to be his successor by his hostility to almost every advance, especially in legislation, was also rapidly declining in health, and finally died in 1788, three years before John. Thus had Wesley witnessed the death of Fletcher, Grimshaw, and his brother Charles, whom he had severally and at different times specifically designated as his successors in office. Can any one doubt, then, that it was Wesley's great and primary design and desire to make British Methodism successively episcopal?

But it is thought that we should look to the famous Deed of Declaration, signed by Wesley in 1784, for his latest and maturest thoughts upon the form of church government which he designed the Methodists to possess. Having seen the permanent and persistent conviction in the mind of Wesley almost from the beginning as to a successor, it would at least appear now strange if within three years of his death his mind and judgment upon this point should undergo an entire revolution. We believe it did not. That this Declaration aided to create the confusion in the conferences after his death concerning Wesley's desire, we cheerfully allow. And so far, therefore, as it bore upon church government at all, it was unfortunate in its language. Had this Declaration, then, never been written, not only would the

conferences have been saved much needless agitation, but the Connection, following the life-long judgment of their founder, would have become episcopal. And it should be remembered that Wesley was entirely satisfied with the "model deed" to which we have referred, and gave a plan of succession. Some of the preachers, however, were not satisfied. But "Wesley replied that the Trust Deed in itself was quite sufficient; that it had been drawn up by three of the most eminent counselors in London, and that, even supposing there might be some defect in it, no one would be so mad as to go to law with an entire body of people like the Methodists." But even this did not satisfy some of the preachers. "At length Wesley began to yield to the pressure that was brought upon him, and various schemes were propounded to accomplish the purpose upon which men like Hampson and Oddie had set their hearts." —*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 420. This shows that this Declaration did not originate with Wesley; that he was opposed to it; that he at last only yielded under pressure. Again, it is worthy of note that John Wesley did not write the Declaration. It was written by Dr. Coke, assisted by two other legal gentlemen. (*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 421.) It is true, however, that after it had been written, and Wesley had filled in the names of the Legal Hundred, he signed and defended the document, but the reader should have the benefit of the above fact. And it is also true

that, so far as we can find, he never defended any part of the document supposed to forbid the establishment of episcopacy. And we may mention also that Dr. Whitehead, who was appointed by the first Conference after Wesley's death to write his life from authentic documents placed in his hands, says, that "the reader should be apprised that neither the design of it, nor the words of the several clauses, are to be imputed to Mr. Wesley. So far was he from forming any design of a deed of this kind that I have good evidence to assert it was some time before he could be prevailed upon to comply with the proposal; and, as in most other cases where he followed the same guide, he soon found reason to repent."—*Lives of the Wesleys*, p. 517.

Did Wesley ever regret signing this deed? Moore, who wrote the "Life of Wesley" about thirty years after, positively denies that Wesley ever did repent of this act. Tyerman, his latest and fullest biographer, while he is mainly non-committal, does not at least contradict Whitehead. We think there is a medium ground to be taken between these contending parties, which is the true one. So far as this Deed secured *in perpetuo* the church property to the Connection as a body it had his indorsement, but so far as it otherwise reflected a form of church polity it was not in harmony with his best ideal. This opinion is supported by the chief design of this Deed, which was to so define the expression used in

the "model Deed," "the yearly Conference of the people called Methodists," as that it might be a legal body to hold and control the various church properties after Wesley's death. The preamble is clear proof of this. Having stated the history and design of the "model deed," it proceeds to say: "And whereas, for rendering effectual the trusts created by the said several gifts or conveyances, and that no doubt or litigation may arise with respect to the interpretation and true meaning thereof, it has been thought expedient by the said John Wesley on behalf of himself as donor of the several chapels, etc., to *explain* the words, 'yearly Conference of the people called Methodists,' contained in all the said trust deeds, and to declare what persons are members of the said Conference, and how the succession and identity thereof is to be continued." This shows that the great design of this Deed was simply to make the yearly Conference clearly a legalized body to control the church property, so that at his death it could not break up into congregationalism.

John Pawson, one of the most eminent preachers of that day, says: "The one design of the Deed, *to my certain knowledge*, was to prevent any preacher who might be inclined to settle from taking possession of any of our chapels;" and he says further, "The electing of their own president and secretary," which the Deed prescribed, "appears to me to be a matter of little consequence."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 423.

Wesley did not intend to abrogate the plan of personal succession, which was his life-long desire. The "Deed of Declaration" said nothing about the method of appointing the preachers, but the "model deed" gave that right to his successor. This Deed said nothing about ordination. Wesley claimed this as a providential power, and intended only his successor to exercise that power in Great Britain. He did not design, as we think, to give in the Deed of Declaration his views of church government, only so far as they affected the question of church property. His opinions upon this subject are to be found elsewhere. That he designed an order of superintendents or bishops, notwithstanding this Deed of Declaration, is evident from the fact that even in this same year—in fact, only about one month from the time of signing this Deed—he sent a Ritual to America providing for an order of superintendents or bishops. And that he designed his own Conference to follow the same form of church government is clear from the fact that in about four years after this he provided a ritual for their use, establishing therein, also, an order of superintendents. Was it not, then, his design all the while that British Methodism should be episcopal, having an order of superintendents or bishops? But the agitated Conference succeeding Wesley's death seems to have failed to discover this life-long purpose of their founder.

4. Possibly another cause operating against the adoption of the episcopal form of government was the unsettled condition of the American Methodist episcopacy at this time. The period from 1791 to 1797 includes the Hammett and O'Kelly excitements in American Methodism. This same period also includes the time during which British Methodism was endeavoring to settle its form of polity. How much the one influenced the other we cannot at this distance certainly know. It is fair to presume, however, that, so far as their influences did go, they were adverse to the establishment of episcopacy in Great Britain.

5. Another cause of failure we may mention was, the apparent inability of the British Methodists to comprehend a moderate episcopacy. Episcopacy was to them a synonym of prelacy. The latter, as it had existed around them, many of them had greatly disliked, to say nothing stronger. Hence, when Mather, Taylor, Pawson, Bradburn, Rogers, Moore, Adam Clarke, and Coke, prepared and presented to the Conference of 1794 their plan for an order of superintendents, the cry was raised that it was "a conspiracy to place pretentious prelates over the people." This was sufficient to secure the defeat of the measure. Coke was censured with being the author of the plan. That he may have been its author is quite probable; but that he proposed the establishment of prelacy was unfounded. As it

regards liberality of views on church government Coke was in most respects in advance of Wesley. He was more anxious for a distinct and entire separation from the Church of England. In the establishment of the British Conference Coke desired every preacher to be a member of the Conference, instead of only the Legal Hundred. (*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 421.) In 1791 he had published a circular in America in which he says: "Five things we have in view:—

"1. The abolition of the arbitrary aristocracy.

"2. Invest the nomination of the presiding elders in the Conference.

"3. Limitation of the districts to be invested in the General Conference.

"4. An appeal allowed each preacher on the reading of the stations.

"5. A General Conference of at least two thirds of the preachers as a check upon every thing."—*History and Mystery*, p. 64.

Do not these facts wholly refute that unkind imputation of Tyerman (vol. ii, p. 433) against Dr. Coke, when he says of him "that he was dangerously ambitious, and that the height of his ambition was a desire to be a bishop." Is not such a statement also in the very teeth of the founder of Methodism, who said: "I believe Dr. Coke is as free from ambition as from covetousness?" In view of Dr. Coke's proverbial generosity this was a very strong

declaration in favor of his humility. How senseless, then, the statement that Coke and the other most learned and pious men were conspiring to place over the people "pretentious *prelates!*" In consequence of such prejudices the English Methodists failed to comprehend the importance of a moderate episcopacy, so much admired by their founder, and so clearly warranted by the history of the pure and post-apostolic Church.

6. Another reason why British Methodism did not become episcopal was, no doubt, Wesley's failure to clearly, and openly, and sufficiently emphasize the fact that he had ordained Mr. Mather a superintendent or bishop, and that he intended him to ordain others. This not being done, it made Mather's statement open to suspicion, at least. Had it been sufficiently authenticated to satisfy the Conference, Mather would, no doubt, have been considered Wesley's personal successor, and the vexing questions of appointments, and ordination, and sacraments would have been largely, if not wholly, prevented, and British Methodism would have continued, what in reality it was from the beginning, episcopal.

7. And, finally, we mention the greatest general cause of this failure; it was Wesley's continued unwillingness to acknowledge himself or his Societies as separate and distinct from the Church of England. No subject during his life gave him more trouble than this. Some Churchmen were telling him that

to be consistent he should declare himself independent. Some Churchmen in his own Connection were severely chiding him for having varied already so much from the Church of England. Others were clamoring for separation. They considered themselves entangled and embarrassed so long as they failed to make this declaration. Here was a dilemma. Unhappily, he adopted an anomalous position, declaring, in theory, that he did not and would not separate, yet in practice separating from the Established Church. His latest biographer, in strong yet truthful language, says: "With great inconsistency he still persisted in calling himself a member of the Church of England, and, as will be seen, to the day of his death told the Methodists that if they left the Church they would leave him. All things considered, this was not surprising, but it was absurd. Great allowance must be made for Wesley; but to reconcile his practice and profession in this matter during the last seven years of his eventful life is simply impossible."—*Tyerman*, vol. iii, p. 449.

This, we believe, is the simple truth. If the British Methodists were not really a separate body during Wesley's life they have never been since his death. So far as we know, no formal declaration of separation has ever been made. But it would be nonsense to say that they are not a separate body. Had he, while living, proclaimed them a separate body, the Connection would have been free to pro-

ceed to settle its own form of government. But hampered as it was, it was ever and anon vacillating between rigid high-Churchism on the one hand and the liberty of Methodism on the other. And these extremes met under the leadership of Wesley. They continued in the Connection after his death. One party based its arguments on the profession of their founder, and the other upon his practice. During the six years following his death "public assemblies, district meetings, and delegated conventions were held, and were often inflamed with excitement. Good men mourned at the perilous prospect of the great cause, and its enemies congratulated one another on its probable failure. While its guides were exhorting or remonstrating with each other Churchmen were seeking to draw it into the Establishment, and Dissenters increased its distractions by discussions of its system as incoherent and impracticable." "The diversified opinions of the Connection were, in fine, resolving themselves into three classes, and giving rise to as many parties, composed respectively (1) of men who, from their attachment to the Establishment, wished no change unless it might be a greater subordination to the National Church by the abandonment of the sacraments in those cases where Wesley had admitted them; (2) of such as wished to maintain Wesley's plan intact, with official provisions which might be requisite to administer it; and (3) such as desired revolutionary changes, with a more

equal distribution of powers among laymen and preachers. It was not difficult to perceive that if the Church was to be saved the middle party must prevail for the present. Even should its principles be pronounced not abstractly the best, it was evident that they were practically the best for the time being."—STEVENS'S *Methodism*, vol. iii, pp. 25, 26. See what a seething ecclesiastical caldron Wesley had left for his Societies by his persistent refusal to admit their separate existence as a Church! Existence or destruction, as the only alternatives, now stared them in the face. The most intelligent, and those who knew best the real mind of Wesley upon church government, found themselves outnumbered by the less intelligent masses. The question arose, Shall we cause the Connection to be divided, and perhaps destroyed, by firmly maintaining the real form of government believed in by our founder, or shall we concede a little, and keep the body united? They wisely adopted the latter. The Conference (1797) decided to annually elect a president instead of choosing an "order of superintendents" or bishops, as provided by Wesley in his English Prayer Book a few years previously, and, besides this, they gave greater power to the Societies. "It is not surprising that some of the preachers feared the result of these important concessions. Henry Moore, the friend and counselor of Wesley, opposed them as sapping the ecclesiastical foundations of Methodism,

and was strongly tempted to retire from it in despair." And perhaps they feared most of all for the concessions they had made concerning the administrative or executive department of the Church. They knew that it was Wesley's long-settled conviction that for many to rule was not best. They immediately saw, what many since have observed in British Methodism, that there was a weakness in the chief executive power of the Church. They then tried to remedy it. "A proposition was made to *fortify* the executive power of the Conference after these great modifications. . Coke, Mather, and Moore spoke strongly in favor of what they called Wesley's plan, which was to appoint twelve ministers (which we have seen he first contemplated instead of the Legal Hundred) or bishops, two of whom should be in Scotland, three in Ireland, and seven in England." —*Stevens*, vol. iii, p. 75. But this failed. Thus it is that British Methodism finally failed to adopt the moderate episcopal form of church government, the great preference of its illustrious founder.

And, the whole truth being told, the Wesleyan Methodists were, perhaps, justified, considering the peculiar circumstances, in not adopting episcopacy; we shall soon see how that the American Church, free from those embarrassments, was left free to choose an episcopal form of government, the ideal of Wesley. Whether Wesleyan Methodism might not have succeeded even more grandly than its grand

history now tells if it had adopted episcopacy even at that critical time cannot, of course, be known, but certain it is that it has been outstripped in the race by its American offspring with episcopacy. In its moderate episcopacy American Methodism certainly has an efficient executive force which Wesleyan Methodism lacks.

CHAPTER VI.

How the Methodist Church in the United States Became Episcopal—The Episcopacy a Strong Bond of Union.

HAVING considered how and why Methodism in England failed to become episcopal in its form of government, let us now consider how it became so in the United States. To some it may appear strange that we shall claim that the American Methodists have very nearly adopted Wesley's ideal of church government. Yet if all the facts are impartially weighed we believe that our claim will be sustained. We have seen that a moderate episcopacy was his preference—his ideal—the only fair and full form of church organization that he gave to the world. In that form was suggested the ordination of a superintendent, elder, and deacon. Referring to Dr. Coke's ordination by Wesley, Tyerman says, (vol. iii, p. 438:) "He ordained a superintendent; but he never thought to call him bishop." That is a fair and honest statement. Between Wesley and the American Church there never was any difference on this matter except as to terms. And even Wesley said nothing as to its use in the Minutes as synonymous or explanatory—until the term "bishop" began to be applied to Coke and Asbury. This is

proved by his letter to Asbury in 1788, nearly four years after the word had been used in the Minutes. The Minutes of that first Conference say: "*Following the counsel* of Mr. John Wesley, who recommended the episcopal mode of church government, we thought it best to become an episcopal Church, making the episcopal office elective, and the elected superintendent or bishop amenable to the body of ministers and preachers." This, in brief, is how and why the Methodists in the United States became episcopal in their form of government. And with all that was before them what body of men would have done differently? What they did was not only suggested and approved by Wesley, but approved also by the American Methodists.

That the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church with a moderate episcopacy, and without lay delegation, was generally approved both by the ministry and membership, is clear from the general concurrence and satisfaction both as to the fact and form of its government, as well as from the explicit testimony of the following witnesses, some of whom were members of the Conference of 1784, when the Church was organized. Says Rev. Thomas Ware, (who was present at that Conference,) speaking of the choice of title for the new organization, that of the Methodist Episcopal Church having been proposed: "There was not, to my recollection, the least agitation on the question. Had the Conference indulged

a suspicion that the name they proposed to adopt would be in the least degree offensive to the views or feelings of Mr. Wesley they would have abandoned it at once, for the name of Mr. Wesley was inexpressibly dear to the Christmas Conference, and especially to Mr. Asbury and Dr. Coke." Says William Watters, the first native American traveling preacher, (p. 102:) "We became, instead of a religious Society, a separate Church, under the name of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This change gave general satisfaction through all our Societies." Says Lee, in his "History of Methodism," (p. 107:) "The Methodists were pretty generally pleased at our becoming a Church, and heartily united together in the plan which the Conference had adopted. And from that time religion greatly revived." From the fact that no one excepting Asbury traveled more extensively through the Methodist Societies after the formation of the Church than did Lee, and thus having an opportunity to know the opinions of the people, gives great weight to his testimony. Says Rev. Ezekiel Cooper, one of the most learned men of early Methodism: "From that time the Methodist Societies in the United States became an independent Church under the episcopal mode and form of government. This step met with general approbation, both among the preachers and members. Perhaps we shall seldom find such unanimity of sentiment upon any question of such magnitude." Says Dr. Emory,

"Defense of Our Fathers," (p. 120:) "We maintain that the proceedings of that Conference in organizing the Methodist Episcopal Church, with general superintendents, vested with episcopal powers, and intended to act as bishops, were in fact, if not in form, approved and sanctioned by the people (the Methodist people) of that day." Lastly, says Dr. Stevens, (*History M. E. Church*, vol. ii, p. 242:) "The new episcopal organization appears to have been quite unanimously approved by the Methodists. Watters assures us that in the Christmas Conference, which adopted it, there was not one dissenting voice. I know of no recorded dissent in the entire Church of that day." And all the above goes to confirm what Bangs says, (vol. i, p. 165,) "that their [the laity's] voice was in exact accordance with the proceedings of the Conference." Do not the above facts of history clearly prove our point, that the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church with a moderate episcopacy and without lay delegation gave general satisfaction throughout the ministry and the laity?

The above facts cannot be refuted, neither can they be weakened by counter testimony. None can be furnished.

No division in the Methodist Episcopal Church has ever taken place because of episcopacy *itself*. No party has ever, from the foundation of the Church to the present time, left the Church because, as a *leading* objection, they desired the abolition of

the episcopacy. Some, we know, have endeavored to make the opposite appear. They refer to Hammett in 1791. But this man's action was not properly a secession, since Hammett never was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church or Conference. In Asbury's Journal (vol. ii, p. 143) we read: "He was unknown, a foreigner, and did not acknowledge the authority of, nor join in connection with, the American Conference." Here we might dismiss the reference to this matter as wholly irrelevant. He, then, did not secede from, because he did not belong to, the Methodist Episcopal Church. But as he led away a party from the Methodist Episcopal Church, which after his death became scattered and extinct, we may ask, what were his objections to the Methodist Episcopal Church? Now, it will be remembered that it is a matter of supposition that the episcopacy was the great object of his hate. In Bangs's "History of Methodism" (vol. i, p. 228) we find Asbury's objections stated in order by himself: "He had three grand objections to us: 1. The American preachers and people insulted him. 2. His name was not printed on our Minutes. (And for the good reason that he had never united with the American body.) 3. The *Nota Bene* Minute was directed against him." (This was a cautionary note suggested by Mr. Wesley to prevent imposture by requiring every minister, coming from Europe or elsewhere, to furnish a certified letter or parchment from Wesley

or some elder, and was not especially directed against him.) "We are considered by him as seceders from Methodism, because we do not wear gowns and powder, and because we do not pay sufficient respect to Mr. Wesley." "This was the pretense," says Bangs, "but it is manifest that Mr. Hammett, who had recently arrived from the West Indies, was not willing to submit to the authority of the Conference and to Bishop Asbury." He could not have objected to the appointing power of the bishop as a departure from Methodism, or that in this the American Conference did not sufficiently respect Mr. Wesley, since Wesley had assumed and exercised, until his death, this power, which was conferred upon Asbury by the American Conference in obedience to Mr. Wesley's wish. The power of the American bishop was much more limited than the power of Wesley, and both the bishop and his power were entirely under the control of the Conference. And, finally, it cannot be proved that Hammett desired the abolition of the American episcopacy, even if it could be proved that he objected mainly to some of the power of the bishop.

The secession of O'Kelly, in 1792, appears to have arisen more from dissatisfaction on account of the power lodged in the hands of the bishops and presiding elders than from opposition to the offices themselves. His proposition, as submitted to the Conference, did not, indeed, touch the presiding elder

question: it referred solely to the appointing of the preachers. The resolution gave the bishop the power to appoint, and then asked for the right to appeal from such appointment in case any preacher felt himself injured. (See BANGS'S *History of M. E. Church*, vol. i, p. 344.) The question was debated for some time, and Lee, who was present and on the negative, says: "A large majority appeared at first to be in favor of the motion. But at last John Dickins moved to divide the question thus: 1. Shall the bishop appoint the preachers to the circuits? 2. Shall a preacher be allowed an appeal? After some debate the deciding of the question was carried. The first question, being put, was carried without a dissenting voice." But when the Conference reached the second question, whether a preacher should be allowed an appeal, it "was lost by a large majority." And it should be remembered that this controversy occurred before the usage of the "bishop's cabinet," by which, with the wise counsels of the presiding elders, the appointments are made.

The secession of the "Reformed Methodists," a faction led off by Pliny Brett, in 1813, was occasioned not by dissatisfaction with the episcopacy, but because of an alleged lack of piety in the Church. As proof, we refer to page 162 of Porter's "Compendium of Methodism," which says Brett "withdrew from the Church and placed himself at the head of a party pretending to peculiar attainments in holiness,

and went about to infect others with the disease of his own heart, and rally for a new organization," under the name of "Reformed Methodists." "With this specious title they went forth, berating their old friends as backsliders and formalists, and calling upon all who loved the power of religion to come to the new standard." Thus it is seen that the episcopacy of the Church was not the cause, in any sense, of this separation.

We may also refer to the separation of the Methodist Protestants in 1827–30. But we have elsewhere, often and beyond the possibility of refutation, proved that not episcopacy, but simply the lack of lay delegation in the General Conference, was, in this case, the great cause of separation. Their greatest polemic champion of that day, or any other, M'Caine, said: "On the other points which we have mentioned above [the episcopacy and presiding eldership] we place comparatively no stress. We are not tenacious of them. We are willing, if it be thought best, to relinquish any or all of them." The episcopacy of the Church, then, was not the cause of separation. And, lay delegation now being incorporated in the General Conference, the great objection of the reformers is taken away.

Hence we have found that not a single one of these divisions was professedly or chiefly originated because of, or to abolish, the episcopacy. And we might say the same of every other separation in the

history of the Church. We cheerfully admit that some of them did introduce measures tending, more or less, to modify the episcopacy, but no proposition was ever offered by any one of them to do it away. Thus it is clear that episcopacy itself has not been a cause of division in the Church. No Protestant Church in the United States has had more ecclesiastical repose and more freedom from doctrinal and governmental strife than the Methodist Episcopal Church. The fact that she has had occasional discussion and modification proves the flexibility and plasticity of her system, and that it is not antiquated or fossilized.

There is an additional fact that has not escaped the notice of the impartial reader of Methodist history—that every one of those bodies, without exception, that left the Methodist Episcopal Church, has either utterly perished or made very indifferent progress.

Hammett's new organization, called the "Primitive Methodists," is not the Church now known by that name. "All the churches and parsonages built by this body" were finally turned over to the Methodist Episcopal Church. But what became of his members? "Many of them returned to the fold where they had been formerly fed, some went to other Churches, and not a few went back to the world." "He died in 1803, about eleven years after he withdrew, and the party became extinct."—STEVENS'S

Hist. M. E. Church, vol. iii, pp. 48, 49. What a sudden and disastrous failure! While he was not properly one of us, yet he induced many to leave the Church who perhaps suffered moral shipwreck. But let us notice another similar instance.

O'Kelly seceded in 1792. He began to organize a Church under the plausible name of "Republican Methodists." In 1793 they formed Societies "on a *leveling* plan." "All were to be on an equal footing. One preacher was not to be above another, nor higher in office or in power than another. No superiority or subordination was to be known among them. They promised to the lay members of the Church greater liberties than they had formerly enjoyed among us, and prevailed with a good many of our people to leave us and join them." The O'Kelly schism has a practical lesson for to-day. Their success did not measure up to the high sound of their captivating manifesto. Despising rule, they became unruly. Rejecting subordination, they became factious. In 1801 they discarded their own laws and title, and assumed what seemed to them a less political and more churchly name, "The Christian Church," renouncing all rules of government but the New Testament, and allowing each one to interpret it for himself. The exclusiveness of the name on the one hand, and the excessive liberty of practice on the other, were disastrous to them. As might be expected, the Church soon broke up into parties.

Said Lee in 1809: "They have been divided and subdivided, till at present it is hard to find two of them that are of one opinion. There are now but few of them in that part of Virginia where they were formerly the most numerous, and in most places they are declining." "Many individual members and preachers, tired of the conflict, sought peace again in the parent Church." Thus in the short space of seventeen years the organization had well-nigh perished. It is now wholly extinct. What a sad history is this! How full of warning to all who go upon "the leveling plan," and who reject proper rule and subordination in the ministry of the Church!

We now note the history of the "American Wesleyan Church." Although the ostensible cause of this secession in 1843 was slavery, yet they in their organization repudiated episcopacy, and some of them said hard things of the Methodist Episcopal Church for retaining it. They had for a time a somewhat vigorous growth, yet in about ten years began to show undoubted signs of rapid decline. The highest number it ever reported was about twenty-five thousand in 1850. It now numbers less than twenty thousand. Many of the founders, leaders, and members of this body are wisely reoccupying their places in the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Methodist Protestant Church seceded in 1830. They went out at a very favorable time to insure

their success. A republican sentiment was the sentiment of the time. They have from first to last sounded the cry that their principles were more in harmony with our republican institutions. For awhile this sound was captivating. Without reciting the whole history, what is the result? Not saying that that organization has been a comparative failure—for it has done great good—the candid mind must admit that it has not achieved its expected success. Now, after about forty-five years of toil, the Church, North and South, does not number, perhaps, more than one hundred and twenty thousand members. Compare this period of denominational history with the same number of years selected from any portion of the history of the Methodist Episcopal Church, even during the desolation of the Revolution, or embracing any of the above secessions, and the Methodist Protestant Church will fall sadly behind. It is seen that as a Church it lacks unity, adhesion, and connectional force. In a word, it lacks the principle of general superintendence. Without intending to reflect upon that Church, we ask, Is there any thing in its history that furnishes a good reason why the Methodist Episcopal Church should now destroy, much less essentially modify, its episcopacy?

All those bodies that left the Methodist Episcopal Church, having the episcopacy, the presiding eldership, or lay delegation, as even collateral causes, have either wholly perished, or have had very meager

success. They all organized upon the *leveling* plan. And it is but true history to say that no Methodism in this land of republicanism and free institutions has succeeded comparatively with episcopal Methodism; and it is also true that no other Methodism has like reasonable prospects for success in the future. And it is coming to be more and more realized that a moderate episcopacy, or superintendency, such as the Methodist Episcopal Church has, is a proper and potential element in church government. So clearly is this being seen that even the eminent "London Quarterly Review," a Wesleyan periodical supposed to be opposed to episcopacy, speaking, in 1856, of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States, says: "It may be questioned whether any form of church government *in the world* has more of the elements of *power* and *permanence* than this, which expresses *Wesley's own idea* of a fully organized Church."

But let us now show that this form of church government was of loyal and native American election. True, it was of foreign suggestion, but it was of American adoption; just as our national government and laws find their suggestion and analogy in the British government and laws, but still are American. John Wesley suggested the plan of church government, but his suggestion was of no binding force until American votes chose and adopted it. When the Church was organized, in 1784, this question was

asked by that body assembled: "What form of church government shall we choose?" They answered it by adopting the Methodist Episcopal. Dr. Bangs says that during the war, and previous to it, every one of the foreign missionaries or preachers had either located, died, or returned to England, except Asbury. At the time of organizing the Church there were in America eighty-one preachers, about sixty of whom were present. Dr. Coke presided, and hence did not vote. Asbury had already adopted America as his home. Besides him were Vasey and Whatcoat, elders, who had come as assistants to Dr. Coke. But counting out Asbury, Vasey, and Whatcoat, then all the rest were truly American votes cast in adopting the Methodist Episcopal form of government. This was not, then, something imposed upon American Methodists, but something of their own cheerful election; and, as we have seen, gave almost universal satisfaction.

It is a fact of contemporaneous history that in the year that the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized the Virginia Legislature was memorialized for an act to incorporate the "Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia," and for other advantages in religion. And this was opposed by counter petitions, praying that "no step might be taken in aid of religion, but that it might be left to its own superior and successful influence." Hence the memorials were postponed till the next session, and then rejected;

but a bill for the incorporation of all religious societies which may apply for the same was adopted. (STEVENS'S *M. E. Church*, vol. ii, p. 163.) Referring to this same matter, Dr. Coleman says, in his "Manual on Prelacy," p. 232: "It is well known that the introduction of episcopacy into this country gave rise to long and bitter controversy. The objection made from within the Episcopal Churches, as well as from without, was, that its form of government was anti-republican and opposed to the spirit of our free institutions. The House of Burgesses, in Virginia, composed chiefly of Episcopalians, declared their abhorrence of bishops, unless at the distance of three thousand miles, and denounced the plan of introducing them in the most unexceptionable form on this side of the Atlantic as a pernicious project." As explanatory we have before us a personal letter from Dr. Coleman, in which he says: "The controversy is not, indeed, with that episcopacy which recognizes ours as a part of the holy catholic Church and us as ministers, *but with the exclusive claim of prelacy*." Hence he further says: "After several years the 'Manual' was published, as a revision of a previous edition, under another name. Prelacy was substituted advisedly for episcopacy, as being less invidious, and more nearly expressing our meaning." So this author has no controversy with Methodist episcopacy, as it recognizes others as parts of the Church of God. No colonial or State or National Legislature has ever

had occasion to utter the smallest protest against the powers or purposes of Methodist episcopacy. It has always been a fast friend of our free institutions.

Says Dr. Baird, of another Church, in his "History of the Religions of America:" "We recognize in the Methodist economy, as well as in the zeal, the devoted piety, and efficiency of its ministry, one of the most powerful elements in the religious prosperity of the United States, as well as one of the firmest pillars of their civil and political institutions."

CHAPTER VII.

Offices in the Old and New Testament Ministry.

THE Old Testament, or Jewish, Church recognized three orders in its ministry. Its superior minister was the high-priest; its next was the priest, and its inferior minister was the Levite. There are, perhaps, none who question the strictly ministerial character of the first and second named, but there may be some who doubt the ministerial character of the third. The reasons for this may be briefly stated: 1. Their distinct and Divine selection from the people; 2. They were to take the place of the first-born, who was the household priest; 3. They were not numbered in the armies of Israel, but separately; 4. They were especially consecrated to their office; 5. To them belonged the duty of instructing the people; 6. They were entitled to financial support by the people. As M'Clintock and Strong say: "In this way the Levites obtained a sacrificial as well as *a priestly character*." It seems evident, then, that not only did the Levites constitute a part of the ministerial force of the Jewish Church, but also that that ministry had three offices.

We have thus spoken of the ministerial force in the tabernacle and temple worship. Let us now

speak of the later and more popular worship of the synagogue. We find here the same triplet of ministerial offices: 1. There was the president or chief ruler, who was *primus inter pares*—the first among his equals; 2. The elders; 3. The deacons. It is true, these were not the *names*, according to their language, by which these officers were then known; but the ministerial offices now understood by these terms then existed. This position is well sustained by Coleman, Schaff, Pressensé, and many others. Indeed, after being accustomed to the form of the temple service the Jew would very naturally establish a triad of ministerial offices in the synagogue.

This was the prevalent form of church government when Christ came into the world; and, conforming to this as much as was proper, he soon established likewise three ministerial offices: 1. He himself was the great high-priest, of which all before him had been imperfect types. He was the chief minister of the Gospel sanctuary and the true tabernacle which he was about to set up. 2. The apostles were called to stand next to him in his great office. 3. The seventy were the third and inferior class of ministers. Thus was the Church officered under the personal presence and leadership of Christ. After his ascension it is natural that some changes should take place. The apostles are advanced, not to equality with their Master, but to be his co-ordinate and visible representatives upon earth. And for this

they received adequate power on the day of Pentecost. Church economy did not at once assume, if it ever did, a crisp and crystallized form; it was supple, and shaped itself to emergencies as they arose; so much so that at the close of the apostolic age we find this formula of strictly ministerial officers: 1. The apostles; 2. The elders; 3. The deacons. Now that the deacons of the later apostolic period—to say nothing of the seven early appointed at Jerusalem—were more than laymen, even true ministers, we believe is the latest and truest opinion of ecclesiastical writers. Dr. Coleman, in his "Apostolic Church," more than once argues in favor of "the deacons, the second order of the clergy." And Pressensé, in his "Apostolic Era," says: "Besides, the seven first appointed had been more than deacons; [simply charity dispensers;] they had taught with power, and fulfilled by anticipation the office of elders. Just as the diaconate had grown out of the apostolate, so the office of elders was in part an offshoot from the primitive diaconate; and thus the organization of the Church went on perfecting itself by the division of labor." And in his "Apostolic Church" Dr. Schaff says that the requirement that the deacons should be "sound and well instructed in the faith," looks to their participation in the pastoral work, and also in the business of teaching. That these helpers at this time also preached the Gospel, when properly gifted, is shown by Philip and Ste-

phen. It was very natural that those who distinguished themselves in this service by their gifts and zeal should be advanced to higher offices. So Philip is afterward called an evangelist, and most expositors refer the 1 Timothy iii, 13 to promotion from the office of deacon to that of presbyter. From all this it is clear that the deacons in the apostolic Church had a far higher and more spiritual vocation than the ministers of the Jewish synagogues, who opened and closed them, kept them clean, and handed out the books for reading." This extended extract is justified by the eminent character of its author. It confirms the long-established conclusion that the diaconate, in the apostolic Church, was an office in the ministry, and that those offices were three in number. We do not debate the question whether the apostolate was to be permanent or temporary; we simply note the *fact* that there were in the apostolic Church three offices in the ministry.

In the immediate post-apostolic age the same fact is clearly recorded. The epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians is our first document. And here it should be remembered that this letter, of all the ancient patristic writings, is considered the most valuable and pure. It was read side by side in the churches with the inspired epistles. He, referring to the ministry of his day, more than once uses the words "bishop, presbyter, and deacon." Here, again, we say nothing about the names or nature of

these offices, but simply record the fact that there was a trio in the ministerial office. And whatever may be thought objectionable in the use of these terms or the nature of the offices described by them, it is well known to every careful reader of ecclesiastical history that they soon came into very general use as descriptive terms of the ministry as distinguished from the laity. It is needless to quote authors to confirm our statement. And it will be seen that the number of these ministerial officers is identical with that of the New Testament Church.

It is very probable that the Protestant Churches have not always fairly presented the position of the Roman Catholic Church upon this question. It is true that we are not wholly responsible for this, for they have not always agreed among themselves as to the number of ministerial offices. Elliott on Romanism says that the following division is "according to the most authentic standards. The Council of Trent divides them into greater and less. Aquinas gives the division, sacred and not sacred. The greater or sacred orders are the priesthood, deaconship, and subdeaconship. The other four orders are called minor or not sacred."

According to this, then, the Roman Catholic Church has three holy orders or strictly ministerial officers. Other writers use the formula, bishop, priest, and deacon. Perhaps the most correct of the authorities teach that the episcopate is but an

extension of the priesthood. And now, offering no apology for what seems to us needless names and divisions of church officers, and undue sanctity supposed to attach to them, still, underneath it all we find the fundamental idea that, properly, there are three offices in the Christian ministry. This we shall also find was the true teaching of the Protestant Reformation. Dr. Mosheim, who is, we believe, the truest exponent of the teachings of the Reformation, says, after referring to presbyters: "The Church was undoubtedly provided from the beginning with inferior ministers or deacons. And it appears not only probable, but evident, that the young men who carried away the dead bodies of Ananias and Sapphira were the subordinate ministers or deacons of the Church at Jerusalem." And the same eminent author says of the Lutheran Church, of which he was a profound divine, that while, on the one hand, rejecting a *jure-divino* episcopacy, on the other, it is of the opinion "that a certain subordination, a diversity in point of rank and privileges among the clergy, are not only highly useful, but also necessary to the perfection of church communion."—Vol. ii, p. 84. Zwingle taught the same doctrine, as the same author says he allowed a certain "subordination and difference of rank among the ministers of the Church, and even thought it expedient to place at their head a perpetual president or superintendent, with a certain degree of inspection and authority over the

whole body."—Vol. ii, p. 109. Calvin, the follower of Zwingle, says: "As we have stated that there are three kinds of ministers recommended to us in the Scriptures, so the ancient Church divided all the ministers it had into *three orders*." He then refers to Jerome, who speaks of five classes of Church membership, and, having mentioned believers and catechumens, he speaks of the ministers as "bishops, presbyters, and deacons."—*Inst.*, vol. ii, p. 273. This is quite sufficient to show what was the teaching of the Reformation upon this subject, and that teaching was that there are three offices in the Christian ministry.

And this was John Wesley's matured judgment; and while he rejected a *jure-divino* episcopacy, still he at once and always maintained three offices in the ministry of a well-ordered Church. His latest biographer says of him: "The recorded decisions of the Conference of 1745 (when he was but forty-two years old) plainly show that he regarded his preachers as deacons and presbyters, and thought himself a scriptural bishop. Lord King's researches (which he read in 1746) served to confirm these sentiments." And it is well known that Lord King ably supports these three offices of bishop, presbyter, and deacon by the numerous documents of the primitive Church. In 1747 Wesley and his Conference said that while they did not believe that any specific and uniform form of government was prescribed in the New Testament,

yet they adhered to the position that these three offices in the ministry were "plainly described, bishops, priests, and deacons, and generally obtained in the Churches of the apostolic age." And when John Wesley came to give directions as to the formation of the Methodists in America into an independent Church, in 1784, he provided that they should have three offices in the ministry, by giving them "The Form and Manner of Making and Ordaining of Superintendents, Elders, and Deacons." And it should be remembered that this was the only untrammeled opportunity that Wesley had during his life-time to organize a Church. Hence it is fair to presume that so far as he indicated to the American Methodists any kind or form of church government it would express most freely and fully his own judgment and preference. And here we see that he designed that they should have three offices in their ministry. And after the Church was thus formed, according to his suggestion, he never for once expressed the least disapprobation as to these divisions in its ministry. The question may be asked if this was his preferred form, why did he not before his death provide the same for his Societies in England? The case was far different. The war of the colonies had separated the American Methodists and the country from the jurisdiction of England, and, of course, also from the Church of England. Wesley very strangely contended until his death that the Methodists of Great

Britain had not separated from the Church of England. This prevented him from giving them his preferred form of a complete and distinct Church. And let it not be forgotten that, as we have shown, he looked upon his preachers as presbyters and deacons, and also that at least once in his life did he fondly hope to be able to appoint a personal successor, Mr. Fletcher. Had this been done there would doubtless have been perpetuated in British Methodism a triad of ministerial offices similar to that in American Methodism.

But Wesley's letter of 1785, read in the first Conference after his death, has been appealed to as proof that he intended that absolute ministerial equality should exist among them. But when the letter, as to its object and even matter, is properly considered, it teaches nothing of the kind. He had selected what was known as the Legal Hundred; these were in law to constitute the legal Conference. Some of the ministers not in this body feared that after Wesley's death these might take undue advantage of their position "in stationing the preachers, in choosing children for Kingswood School, in disposing of the yearly contribution and the preachers' fund and other public money." Hence he said in that letter, (which was not addressed to all the preachers, but to the Legal Hundred:) "I beseech you by the mercies of God that you never avail yourselves of the Deed of Declaration (which constituted the Legal

Hundred) to assume any superiority over your brethren," (not of the Legal Hundred.)

This is the true meaning of that famous letter. It had no reference to ministerial equality as it regards office or order. It is most evidently, to say no more, a misapplication of the letter to so use it. Wesley's settled conviction was, as we have seen, that it was proper there should be three offices in the Christian ministry. Hence the Methodist Episcopal Church, following his mind and the Scriptures, has three offices in its ministry, bishop, elder, and deacon. And yet this is a trinity in unity. As we think, there have been a vast amount of words wasted and good temper lost over a supposed difference between the words *order* and *office*. Dropping the erroneous and sacramentarian idea of order, then, we may say order or office at pleasure. In the Methodist Episcopal Church the elder is the unit. He only is the fully empowered minister. Dr. Curry, in the New York "Advocate" of March 14, 1872, as we believe, correctly expresses this unity in the trinity of the ministerial office: "A deacon is a minister who, for prudential reasons, foregoes for a time some of the functions of that ministry to which all confess that he is called. A Methodist elder or presbyter is a minister who, without disclaiming any part of the authority of his office, consents to abstain from certain official acts for the sake of the better ordering of the affairs of the associated body of ministers;

and a bishop is an elder to whom has been committed, for the time being, the exclusive duty of performing those special functions which the other brethren consent to forego. This is our ecclesiastical theory of the ministry." Hence, if one wishes to say that we have three orders in the ministry, that is the truth, when properly stated. And if, on the other hand, another wishes to say that we have but one order in the ministry, that is the truth also, when properly stated. Thus the Church occupies the middle ground between extreme episcopacy on the one hand, and extreme liberalism on the other.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Nature of the Presiding Eldership.

THE presiding eldership is an arm of the episcopal service, and we believe that it is the right arm. Weaken it or take it away, and you enfeeble and deform the general superintendency of the Church. It grew out of a necessity for its existence. Asbury, at the very Conference when he was made bishop, felt this necessity, and hence twelve elders were ordained; and such was the present necessity of the office that even at that General, though not a delegated, Conference, they were all made presiding elders, although the specific title was not given them until some time after. Do these original necessities now exist? As to supervision, this necessity exists every-where, if the general superintendence is a necessity every-where. Without the presiding elder the distance between the bishop and the pastor is too great for the most thorough and effective administration.

Would it do to elect one bishop for each Conference and abandon the eldership? No bishop could as effectively superintend a conference as it is now done by five or ten men. Instead of one president, why not elect one for each State in the Union, and

do away with governors? Because there are high national and executive duties which only a president can best perform. So in the Church there are high ecclesiastical and executive duties which only a unified episcopacy can best perform. And the more numerous the episcopacy, the weaker it is.

Shall we elect the presiding elders? They are the agents of the episcopacy. Who would think of talking with a principal about electing his agents for him? Shall we make them co-ordinate in power and authority with the bishops in making the appointments? If the elders in the matter of appointments sometimes misuse the preacher, will it help the matter to give them authority to do so? As the rule now is, the bishop can act independently when the case requires it, and save a brother from injury; but make the elders co-ordinate, and this power is gone; you have no independent friend in the cabinet. And if we ask the privilege of electing the elders to preside over us, then the classes may rightfully claim the right to elect their leaders, and, finally, the people may rightfully claim the right to elect their pastors; then where is the supervisional and connectional system of Methodism? In these things, we believe, governmentally considered, is the secret of the unparalleled success of Methodism during the past century. Shall we weaken or destroy them? This nation in its wonderful history has settled the question that there is a safe medium ground between

absolute monarchy on the one hand, and absolute democracy on the other, and our unequaled prosperity has demonstrated this to be the best ground. So the Methodist Episcopal Church occupies the medium ground between prelacy on the one hand and independency on the other, and its unequaled success is good proof that its governmental system is the safest and the best.

Still we do not ignore that there are some who desire to even more materially modify the system. In the judgment of some preachers and laymen, the presiding eldership is no longer needed in the economy of the Church. They think that it has done time-honored service in the past, but that being no longer needed or effective, it should be honorably retired. And in this judgment no one has a right to question their sincerity. But some of the elements that have gone into its make-up we may question. This office has not been depreciated to any great extent by placing too old, and, hence, to some extent, non-effective men in it. This may have occasionally been the case. But it is a fact that this office is not held in the lowest esteem where there is the most aged officer. Where the officer's competency and efficiency are unquestioned by any, there are often some who think the office unnecessary. They mean no reflection upon the officer. Neither has the office depreciated because too young men have been placed in it. In this case, as in the other, this may have

been occasionally true, but that it has been a general cause no one seriously asserts. Wesley appointed Asbury his "general assistant" over all the Societies and preachers in America when he was only twenty-seven years of age, and when he was only about thirty-eight he was ordained bishop. And in some of the recent conferences we have observed that some of the probationers—the ministers on trial—have been appointed presiding elders. Evidently, what the Church most needs in this and every other office is the proper qualification, irrespective of age.

Neither has the office depreciated because it has been occupied by incompetent persons. In this, as in other instances, it may have been now and then true, but that it has been any thing like general we do not believe. That a principal would knowingly appoint such agents as would bring discredit upon his business, and consequent embarrassment, is not to be believed a moment. So there is no proper motive for a bishop to appoint inefficient men to this office. This office has never been an ecclesiastical retreat for superannuated and unacceptable men. However flippantly some may have thought or said otherwise, it must be candidly admitted that these officers have been taken very generally from the front rank in every Conference. Now let us ask, and answer the question if we can, how this office, of so much acknowledged worth to the Church in the past, has of late been so much depreciated?

1. By taking too local views of its application and importance. It is freely admitted that in some places it apparently has not all of its original value. But is this the fault of the office or the congregation? Have they not in some cases departed from original Methodism, and concluded in a measure to make their own appointments irrespective of this officer? If, then, the office has thus been undervalued, it is certainly not the fault of the officer. And would such places recommend such a plan for the whole Church? We doubt if we could find many intelligent advocates for such a method. Again, would such charges be willing to be left outside of any presiding elder's district, and have none of his supervision or direction either during the year or at Conference? When seriously considered, we doubt if any would accept this position. But if any should be willing to accept such a situation, then we think they are about ready for Congregational Methodism, which has proved to be such a sublime failure. Methodism, to be a success, must preserve a uniform system, and such a system can be preserved only by taking broad and generous views of the workings and adaptations of the entire machinery.

2. Another way of depreciating this office has been by expecting more of the officer than the Discipline requires. It appears highly proper that, when present, the presiding elder should preach at a quarterly meeting. But this is more from custom than law.

The chief importance of the office is not in preachings, but in its supervision. Its most valuable working are unseen, and hence unknown to the general public. Those officers, both in Church and State, are not always the most serviceable who are the most loquacious. It is this supervisory element that is too often left in the background, and we left to value that only which we see and hear. Except from the fact that he is his superior in office, there is no impropriety in the presiding elder occasionally listening to the regular pastor on the quarterly meeting occasion. Indeed, we think that such a course would greatly add to the intelligent supervision of his work. Instead of being wholly dependent upon hearsay, which is often so various, he would thus have some personal knowledge of the pulpit ability of his numerous ministers. And, besides this, the law of the Church does not specify that it is the duty of the presiding elder to preach at all at the quarterly meeting, much less do all the preaching. Again, it is demanded that the officer be present in person at all the quarterly meetings. Even a substitute, his equal or even superior, does not fully meet this requirement. His visit is something like a writ of *habeas corpus*. Let us first issue an injunction, so to speak, that we may know fully what is the law. Aside from the impossibility, in most cases, of complying with this demand, the law does not make it his duty to attend all the quarterly meetings, either

in person or by substitute. He is only required "to be present as far as practicable." And in perfect consistency with such a law, in the absence of the elder or a substitute, which he is not bound to appoint, the preacher in charge can preside over and proceed with the regular quarterly meeting. A very good way to depreciate any office and embarrass the incumbent is to expect more than the law requires, and then make the conviction more or less general that the officer is delinquent.

3. This office has depreciated because it has been viewed mainly from one side. Every public officer holds two relations: one to the power that appointed him, and the other to the object or service for which he was appointed. It is quite true that it has an important relation to the preachers and the people. But it cannot be denied that its first and chief relation is to the episcopacy. It is an adjunct of this office. Its essential nature is an agency, and not a principalship. It primarily exists for the sake of the episcopacy, but its results are in favor of the preachers and people. And while some may think and say, to use a business phrase, that they prefer to deal directly with the principal, should we not have delicacy enough to think that possibly the principal might *prefer* to deal through his agents or middle men? This we know is the general custom, and most think it to their decided advantage. It has always been so, and is so now, that the most impor-

tant duties to be performed by the elder during the interval of the conferences are as the agent of the bishop. He is to take charge of all the preachers and exhorters in his district, "in the absence of the bishop." He is to change, receive, and suspend preachers in his district, according to the Discipline, "in the absence of the bishop." And in earlier times the law provided that he only was to administer the ordinances in the absence of the bishop. Thus the office was created, and has been continued, as a complement of the episcopacy. The bishop thus gains information and experience valuable to him. And we believe that we are entirely correct when we say that there is not a bishop in the Church who would assume to make out the appointments of any Conference without such information. Neither would any one of them be willing at the session of the Conference to throw open his door equally and promiscuously to preachers and laymen. Too much of this is now done, to his great annoyance. As a simple matter of protection, as well as to prepare him for intelligent action, he must have a committee. And if he must have a committee, it must be admitted by all impartial minds that generally no better one could be chosen than that the presiding elders now form.

4. And, lastly, this office has depreciated because it is supposed the Church is now too much officered. It is now occasionally caricatured as the "fifth

wheel." In military life an extra wheel is always considered a necessity to a perfect armament, although it has to be even hauled along. But we know that the figure is not taken from military life, although the Church, as a system of propagandism, resembles it more than it does domestic life. But the fifth wheel, when applied to this office, is as much without sense as when predicated of a wagon. It is admitted by all that the presiding eldership was once not only a useful but necessary part of our Church machinery. We have always had it. When, then, did the four wheels evolve the fifth wheel? It has not been done of late. No, rather, unless we are a false prophet, when you take away this wheel our machinery will lose the smoothness and evenness of its running, and will soon drag in the dust. Have we now too many such officers? Have they been increased too much proportionately? Comparing the present with the organization of the Church in 1784, and taking round numbers, and including both traveling and local preachers, we may state the following proportions:—

Date.	Bishops.	P. E.	Preachers.	Members.
1784.....	1	12	84	15,000
1873.....	13	400	21,000	1,450,000

At the organization of the Church, it will be seen, we had one bishop to twelve elders, one presiding elder for every seven preachers, one preacher for about every one hundred and eighty members, and

one presiding elder for every one thousand two hundred and fifty members. As the case now stands, we have only *one* bishop to over *thirty* presiding elders; one presiding elder to every fifty-two preachers, or, deducting the local preachers, one to every twenty-seven; one preacher to every sixty-nine members, or, deducting the local preachers, one to every one hundred and thirty-two; and one presiding elder to every three thousand six hundred and twenty-five members. And if we were to add Dr. Coke as a bishop to the first statement, and deduct the non-effective bishops from the second, the proportion will be greatly changed in favor of our conclusion. And it will be seen, as it respects these officers, that the Church has very greatly fallen behind in the proportionate increase of them. This argument is, of course, based upon the Church as a whole, and not upon any locality. There may possibly be places where these officers are too few or too many. There may be places, also, where the districts are too large or too small; and at such places the remedy is at hand without legislation or the abolition of the office. An increase of the number of the bishops could not relieve us of the necessity of this office—not unless we would make them about as numerous as are now the presiding elders. For each presiding elder to properly station his own preachers would be as much responsibility as he would be willing to assume. And such a plan could hardly decrease

the number of Church officers or prove a financial saving. Neither can we safely adopt a Wesleyan chairmanship of districts. Our episcopacy is such an important factor in our system as to forbid even the analogy, and much more so the practice. Our economy is a complete and effective system of supervision, from the general down to the particular, from the bishop to the class leader. To take out of this harmonious system the presiding eldership would leave too long a hiatus between the pastor and the bishop. The loss of this important supervisory power, which tends so much to unify the system, would render it quite prone to disintegration and ruin. As it seems to us, what is most needed now is a correct understanding of the nature and relations of this office to the Church, and then all will properly appreciate, support, and maintain it. Other Churches are admiring our complete system of superintendence, and, indeed, are seriously talking of adopting a similar method. Let us not throw aside as worthless so important a part of our machinery, but, with the power of God, let us run it all to its fullest capacity.

CHAPTER IX.

Choosing or Appointing Pastors—Ministerial Term in Cities.

EVERY true Christian has been called and converted by the Holy Spirit. This call and conversion entitle him to all the rights and privileges of a lay member in the Church of Christ. But, in addition to the above call and conversion, the lay member who is to become a minister of the Gospel receives another and special call (for the two are generally separate as to time) and endowment, for the exercise of distinct functions and higher privileges. Now, while there are important and glorious senses in which the laity, thus called and converted, and the ministry, specifically called and endowed, are all brethren, a holy priesthood, yet in other senses they are as distinct as the leader and the led, the teacher and the taught, the shepherd and the sheep. And he who asserts their absolute equality of right and privilege not only contradicts all analogy, but denies God's order and the teaching of the Christian Church. As to the minister's call, all the laity can do is either to ratify and confirm it, or withhold their concurrence. His right and duty to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments to the laity are primarily above and beyond the votes or parchment of the

Church. But the course of the Church in seconding this authority in her usual formal manner, doubtless, is wise and prudent.

But aside from these things as to the relative rights of the ministry and the laity in local Churches, very little that is satisfactory to the inquiring mind which seeks nothing but the simple truth can be derived from the teachings of Christ and his apostles. And this is just as any thoughtful person would expect to find it. The Church was then but in its formative period. The labors of the apostles were chiefly missionary labors. They went from place to place, not generally from the call of the laity or from their own choice, but because their Master had said, "Go." How futile, then, must it be to say, as to the matter of *choosing* or *appointing* pastors to the local Churches, that *this* or *that* plan was the invariable practice of the apostolic Church. But if from their example any preference is to be inferred, we believe the appointing method has it. Jesus *sent* abroad the seventy and the twelve. When the Apostle Peter stood up to preach in Jerusalem, it was not because the people had *chosen* him, or because he *preferred* to preach there, but because the Master had *appointed* him to that place. The Apostle Paul appointed Timothy to take charge of the Church at Thessalonica. And, excepting two or three instances, the persons so appointed went to their charges unasked for by the people, and usually without their own

preference, but by the direction of Him who said, Go preach my Gospel to every creature. And when they chanced to make a choice of their field of labor, as in the case of Peter, that choice was—at least in his case—denied by a direct revelation from heaven.

But we hold that, after all that can be inferred, it is still vague, and the plan of supplying pulpits must be left to be decided by the wisdom of the Churches according to the development of the Church, the manners and customs of the people, and the density of the population. In foreign missionary fields it seems proper not to have any definite limit as to time in a ministerial charge. On frontier territory the itinerancy is the acknowledged grandest system for extending the boundaries of Christ's kingdom and planting the standard of the cross. In large cities and in thickly settled rural districts the reasons for this system do not appear to some so cogent and clear. Yet, without disparaging others, we may ask, taking into account the whole field, city and country, at home and abroad, if by the system of appointing pastors the pulpits of the Methodist Episcopal Church and others of like polity are not more regularly supplied than others, and their labors as efficiently performed, and the relations between pastor and people as harmonious, as where the laity make choice of the pastor, and the pastor selects his charge?

The itinerant plan seems best for the congregation. It is acknowledged to be one of the most powerful agencies in securing the unequaled prosperity of the Methodist Episcopal Church during the past century. It supplies the natural and lawful demand for novelty. The fundamental doctrines of repentance, faith, justification, the witness of the Spirit, are thus presented from different stand-points, and illustrated and enforced in different ways, which will give them a fresh and vigorous hold upon the mind and heart. Thus these soul-saving truths are frequently kept before the people, yet so as not to become tame, monotonous, and powerless. There are few men who cannot present all they know of these doctrines in one or two years; hence after this they must wander off into other fields, foraging for doubtful provender for their congregations. They may furnish truth that will instruct the mind, but will only, like a tangent, touch the heart. But those cardinal doctrines, like so many *radii* or focal lines, strike for the center. There they will collect, melt, burn, and purify the soul. There is only now and then a minister who is able for a life-time, or for any considerable portion of it, to interest and build up a congregation. Beecher, Spurgeon, and Newman Hall are men who have done so. But it can hardly be doubted that if they had divided their labors among different congregations, instead of each confining himself to one, and scattered their influence and

power more profusely, the Congregational, Baptist, and the Presbyterian Churches would have had, as the result of their labors, a larger aggregate membership to-day. And the greatest and best *results*, not *personal preferment*, should be the highest aim of the Christian toiler.

Again, this plan regularly and constantly supplies all the churches. It is a fact very much deplored, and which seems to have been but recently discovered, that about one fourth of all the charges in the Baptist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Churches are either vacant or filled by supplies. That here is a consequent weakness and loss needs no argument to make it evident to thoughtful persons.

But we believe, further, that the itinerant plan is adapted to the development of a more successful ministry. By his experience and observation among different congregations and communities the pastor's knowledge of human nature, its weaknesses and wants, is greatly augmented, and so far as this is valuable it will make him the more successful. It furnishes him with ampler opportunity for correcting his errors and improving his life. The fact of his going to a new charge has something of a warning and a stimulus in it. It cautions him to avoid any mistakes and wrongs committed in the former charge. It urges him to more faithfully cultivate this new field that it may bring forth a more bountiful harvest. It furnishes him time for more careful and

revised study, that he may the more clearly and forcibly present the great and weighty truths of the Gospel. What is hurriedly done is seldom well done. True, some men have minds like a sealed fountain, that needs only to be touched to send forth its healing waters. But most are like the flowing stream; if it would become of service it must be carefully turned aside, and trailed along the new channel, until at last it moves the ponderous machinery. Most minds are cyclopedic; and few are original thinkers. The few are inventors, and the masses at best are only sub-patentees. Of course, these remarks are not supported by a minister who has a chronic affection for laziness. He will do but little good anywhere; and if Providence allowed him to succeed it would wrong the industrious man. But to the live, active minister—one who does not live in the past, but in the present—one who is not satisfied merely with general truth, but aims to be timely and practical in his remarks—to such a one these statements, we think, are not only pertinent but potential. A man may be president of a college a life-time, and still be successful, but only so because he has a frequent change of students. Without the inspiration arising from this change his eloquence and power would become as monotonous as the thunder of Niagara. John Wesley said, in his usual laconic style, that if he were to preach to one congregation for two or three years he would preach them stone

dead. He recognized the beneficial effects upon both pastor and people of frequent changes.

And now is it not best that these changes should take place by uniform limitation of law? We hold that the greatest aggregate good requires that they should thus take place. While some men may be useful in a charge longer than three years, yet many in other charges would not be useful that long. Thus some charges may suffer for the want of a change, and others may suffer by the change. But a man who is successful in one place may be as successful in another place; and, more, he may be very much needed in some place to repair the breaches in the walls of Zion, and infuse life, health, and growth into a weakened and desponding membership. And the man who has failed in one place, perhaps because of circumstances beyond his control, may be eminently successful elsewhere. But in a settled pastorate how can these suffering charges and suffering pastors be relieved? Is the weak and suffering simply to exchange with the weak and suffering? Will a sick man cure a sick man? If the people are to choose their pastors and retain them as long as they choose, if they are wise will not they hold on to a successful pastor? And if he be a pastor who will not run merely for the loaves and fishes, but whose soul's desire is to see the cause of God prosper, will he not remain where he is? Hence we believe that by a system of settled pastorates there is not that efficient

relief to feeble, suffering charges; there is not as great general success attending the *whole* work as by the regular itinerant system. The maximum limit as to the time of general usefulness in a charge is now placed at three years, and this limit may be changed at any time according to the wisdom of the Church. Now, the regular itinerant system is that whereby a pastor is *appointed* to a charge year by year, and whose official time in that charge is limited by Church law. This does not debar the laity from the privilege of expressing their wish or preference as to who shall serve them, or how long he shall remain, yet so as not to retain him longer than three years. The pastor has the same right. And this plan is peculiar to Methodism. It has always been an itinerancy, regulated and limited by law, and not by the confusing dictations of pastor and people. In America the first conferences ordered that some should exchange appointments every three, four, or six months, and then that others should change once a year, and afterward it was changed to two years; but it is now altered to three years, which corresponds to the arrangement in English Methodism.

It never has been questioned that this is the superior system in disseminating the Gospel in rural districts, and in scattering the precious seed throughout the western wilds. But some have doubted whether this is the best system for our large cities. It is said the time is too short for the pastor to be-

come acquainted and known in influential circles. A degree of such acquaintance seems needful for success; but those who are best known are not always the most successful. A prophet is not without honor save in his own country, where he is best known. It is also said that their names are seldom found on committees, or on school boards, and so on. But it remains to be proved that such positions would make them more successful in leading sinners to Christ. We cannot but believe that the more a clergyman avoids side issues and callings, and the more directly he throws his energies into his one great mission, the more successful he will be.

And, last, by this plan every worthy and efficient minister is constantly employed. No time is hereby lost in searching for a field of toil or in waiting for an acceptable call. Every charge has a regular pastor, and every regular pastor a charge. Thus the whole field is constantly cultivated; thus, also, the whole force is constantly worked. And hence it is no wonder that the Methodist field has yielded the most bountiful harvest; and these great advantages and beneficial results are observed by others. Hence their more frequent change of pastor than formerly. So that the changes of pastors in the aggregate are as frequent as by the itinerant plan. Hence we accept the idea as divinely inspired. We are glad that it is securely imbedded in the constitution of the Church, and he who touches it touches a vital

organ. This plan makes truly a Church on wheels. It rolls grandly through the cities and country, freely throwing out light and beauty to all around. It is the ark of the Lord upon a new-made cart, which when the frontiersman, looking up from his toil, beholds, he rejoices at its coming.

A deep lament has been expressed lately about the lack of sufficient success of the various Churches in our larger cities. Other Churches than our own are talking over their seeming failure to attract and save the masses as in former years. This severe self-criticism will certainly be followed with good results. But so far it is chiefly a lament of the ministry. We wish the feeling might be contagious among the entire lay membership as well. This unity of heart-searching would doubtless lead to that unity of Christian effort in all proper religious appliances which is so necessary to success. Without this, even with all other things, new and old, we must measurably fail. With this, crowned with the blessing of God, as it surely would be, no matter under what peculiar form of government we may labor, we may reasonably expect to have heart-cheering prosperity. We are not disposed to think the cause of meager success is so much outward as inward. A drunken man is very likely to blame his old boots or the unevenness of the pavement for his unsteady walk. We are inclined to think that the lack of proportionate progress is not to be so much attributed to the

machinery, or a supposed necessary change in the machinery, as to the power applied. How ready human nature ever is to fly to the material and external for excuses, rather than admit that the fault lies nearer home.

It has been said that chief among the causes of inadequate success in cities is the itinerant system, which limits the ministerial term to three years. This term is, by the law of the Church, the same for city and country. It is now claimed that exceptions should be made to this law in favor of the cities, for the following reasons:—

1. It is thought that in so short a time the minister cannot so attract public notice as to impress the popular mind. That depends, as we think, very much upon his previous reputation elsewhere. Suppose that Summerfield were now living, and it were announced through the religious and secular press that he had been appointed to one of our city churches, or that one of our popular bishops should now be so appointed, how long would it take either of them to attract and impress the popular mind? Thus it is seen that much depends upon previous reputation, and not upon such reputation secured by a previous long pastorate elsewhere. The persons referred to secured their fame rather by the itinerancy. But, after all, is it not rather the exception than the rule that those ministers are most successful who are most generally and personally known

in the city? Are not many among the failures such as are too well known? I mean nothing against their moral character. And if there be in this any supposed reflection upon the ministerial office, we are reminded that our Lord and Master, that great Itinerant, accomplished the least good among the residents of his native town, to whom he was best known. Evidently there is a perpetual, if not universal, application of that saying, "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country."

How many of the eminent ministers of Europe and America are now laboring in the cities of their birth and childhood? Not Spurgeon, nor Newman Hall, nor Punshon, nor Hepworth, nor Adams, nor Tyng, nor Talmage. At most, then, the longest and best acquaintance is not absolutely necessary to success. And, further, we are not convinced that it adds much to a minister's efficiency to get before the public by being placed upon committees and school boards. Our observation, not experience, teaches us that it more or less consumes his precious time, and occasionally involves him in local trouble by being a party to certain transactions, and certainly diverts his mind, more or less, from his one great calling, the salvation of the soul.

2. Again, it is supposed that three years is not sufficient time for a minister to become personally acquainted with a large membership, such as is often found in our city Churches. Of course, it is implied

that this general personal acquaintance is necessary to success. Neither Spurgeon nor Adams are generally pastors. They are, perhaps, not personally acquainted with one fifth of their members, and yet their success is appealed to as a reason why we should extend the ministerial term, or rather, leave it unlimited in the cities. But it may be said they have sub-pastors. So have Methodist preachers sub-pastors—the class leaders. And if only one of these would wholly give his time to this pastoral work, and thus greatly assist the minister in his success, it would be highly proper and useful to duly compensate him. This could be done without change of law or the infraction of the itinerancy, and yet accomplish all that is accomplished by other Churches. Besides this, in the cities a minister can in one day visit at least five times as many members as a pastor on a circuit in the same time, and yet no extension of time is asked for him. And our city charges will not average five times the membership of the circuits. If the city pastor leaves his successor, as he is required to do, a registered account of the residences of his members, he may thus greatly facilitate the labor of his successor.

3. Again, what if some eminent ministers in our cities have in a long pastorate gathered in a large membership? We doubt not that many an obscure itinerant, who has spent the most of his ministerial life on unpromising circuits, has taken more people

into the Church than any of our metropolitan "star" preachers. And are not the souls of the people in the country as valuable as those in the city? For one, we believe if the eminent men before referred to had devoted their labors among different sections and cities of our country, the Congregational, the Baptist, the Episcopal, and the Presbyterian Churches would have had each a greater aggregate membership to-day. Why should a few cities or churches monopolize the talent of the Church? If a man is popular in one place there is no reason why he may not be equally or even more so in another. To accomplish the most good in a short time, let him distribute his labors in an apostolic manner among different communities—and no one of the apostles ever spent longer than three years in any one place, except, perhaps, John in his older years.

4. Making an exception of the cities and the city charges would tend to a *class* in the Church. It would make a *class* of ministers. It would make a *class* of churches. It may be said we have this now in reality. Every one knows that wherever we come nearest to this in our practice we have a great troubler to the peace and harmony of the Church. It is largely held in check now by the fact that it is against the law of the Church. Once make it lawful by special statute, and you open a real Pandora's box, out of which would spring a multitude of evils. There would be increased jealousies, strifes, clan-

nishness, enough of which, many know, we have already in our city charges.

5. To make an exception of the cities as to the term of ministerial service is wholly impracticable. So far as we have seen, no method of applying this exception is proposed. It is simply asked that the time in the cities be left indefinite. But still we should ask, if the cities are to be excepted, what cities? If it is not to be left to the option of all cities, then shall the size of a population determine whether the law applies? If so, what shall be the requisite number of the population? Then, might not a town or city falling a little under the required size need the indefinite term as much and perhaps more than another of a greater population? Then, after all, what has the number of the population, abstractly considered, to do with the interests of the Church in that town or city? If only some Churches in certain towns or cities are to be exempt from the three-year rule, then what Churches? Shall we determine it by the number of members? A charge with a few members might apparently need a minister's services as long, if not longer, than a numerous one. Shall it be governed by the amount of salary paid its ministers? What has that, of itself, to do with the religious interests of a congregation?

But we need go no further in the supposed application of this rule to discover the painful fact that to make an exception of some or all of our city

Churches from the three-year rule, and allow them an indefinite pastorate as to time, would eventuate in breaking up the entire itinerant system. And is it not at least strange that some of our people and preachers, thinking them no longer of use, are willing to give up to other denominations our most successful weapons of warfare? And, worse still, that we are greedy to take up the useless weapons which they have thrown down. We have given them our protracted meetings, our class meetings, our *extempore* preaching, and they are now talking of taking our *itinerancy*. They have already been discussing a uniform limited term of ministerial service in a charge, and we are beginning to talk of making it indefinite. They have long felt keenly the fact that by their system about one fourth of all the charges are without regular pastors, and also that about one fourth of their regular pastors are without charges. They begin to admire our regular system of supplies. Thus it is seen that the whole available force is constantly employed, and the whole field constantly tilled, and hence, we repeat it, it is no wonder that the Methodist field has yielded the most bountiful harvest. And while they may wisely adopt our measures, let us not foolishly throw them away. No great system can be expected to work so perfectly as that there shall be every-where the absence of all friction. The greatest aggregate good should be the object constantly aimed at.

And besides all this, the Church in its history once thought it best for the city charges that they have a *shorter* pastorate than the circuits. Indeed, we are not sure but that such a case could be made out now with more reason than the opposite. The first Annual Conference in America, in 1773, ordered that the preacher in New York and the one in Philadelphia should exchange every quarter. The next Conference ordered that they should exchange every six months. Thus they thought a *shorter* term best for the cities. But seeing, no doubt, a necessity for a uniform system of law as to appointments, ever after, so far as we know, they made no exemptions from the rule of the Church. The truth is, as we see it, there can be no true itinerancy without a uniform law as to the method and time of appointments. Those Churches that have adopted the plan of an indefinite term (as the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and the Methodist Protestant Church) certainly do not show superior results either in the city or in the country. The true itinerant system can be the soonest and easiest adjusted to meet any sudden and peculiar emergency. The power to transfer is so ample that if the right man for the right place is found anywhere in the Church, in the home or foreign field, he can be brought to the aid of the desired point in the briefest possible time. This system, then, has advantages over any other. Let us preserve it in its integrity.

CHAPTER X.

Powers of the Laity: Reception and Expulsion of Members.

Reception of Members.

IT is a matter of the first importance to the purity and prosperity of the Church that its door of entrance should be sacredly guarded. This is regarded as a just principle among all secular organizations. Some kind of trial, or probation, or examination into the fitness of persons to be admitted into the Church, is adopted by the ecclesiastical bodies generally. And this plan has existed in some form ever since the days of the apostles. But neither Christ, who could read the heart, nor the apostles, who were inspired to discern the spirits, used or needed such previous trial. Hence they received their converts into full membership at once. "But when the Church was augmented by the accession to her pale of large numbers from heathenism, and when her purity was no longer guarded by the presiding care of those apostles and others who possessed the power of discerning spirits, the custom of deferring the admission of members was adopted, in order to obtain satisfactory evidence of their fitness to be enrolled in the rank of the disciples. The protracted inquiry into

the character and views of candidates for admission was therefore designed, if possible, to prevent the recurrence of apostasies which had disturbed the peace and prosperity of the Church."—M'CLINTOCK AND STRONG, Art., *Catechumens.* "But in the early Church during the persecutions it was dangerous to at once admit professed converts, who might be spies, into the assemblies of the faithful. . . . The catechumens were probationers in the Church, not full members; and this novitiate was designed, first, to keep unworthy persons out of the Church, and, secondly, to train new converts in Christian doctrine and morals."—M'CLINTOCK AND STRONG, Art., *Arcani Disciplina.*

But who had the authority to receive the name of a person as a member or catechumen? Originally it must have been the pastor, and him only. Christ received his disciples without the vote or recommendation of any one. In the first reception of members by the apostles there is no instance in which any church action was taken. And this must, of necessity, have been the case. As the labors of the apostles were chiefly missionary labors, when their first converts gathered about them there were none to recommend them or vote for their reception. Were the three thousand voted in on the day of Pentecost? Who voted for Cornelius and all his kinsmen? Who voted for Lydia and her household, or the jailer and his family? That the laity took

part in the various church actions after they were in the Church must be admitted, but that any church action was taken in their first reception is denied.

Hence it was not only lawful but expedient for the successors of the apostles, who were not blessed with supernatural gifts or prerogatives, to prevent improper persons from entering the societies, to adopt the catechumenate, or probationary system. The time spent in this probation was not, in the early history of the Church, the same in all the Churches. The Apostolic Constitutions—not, however, composed by the apostles, as the title would indicate—made the term three years. One council in the sixth century made it two years. One in the fifth made it eight months, some forty days, and others as short as seven days. In the British Wesleyan Church it is three months. In the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1784 it was three months, but in 1789 it was extended to six months, and so remains to this time. Such persons may be probationers a longer time, but not less. But let that period be long or short, six months or one day, and let it be termed catechumenate, probation, or session, the thing itself is recognized by nearly all Churches.

As early as the first or second century we find the name of catechist and catechumen. "At first it was the office of the bishop to prepare the catechumens for baptism, as well as to admit them into the Church by that sacrament. But in course of time it

became impossible for the bishops to devote the requisite attention to this part of their work, and consequently they transferred it to such presbyters and deacons as they deemed competent to the undertaking."—M'CLINTOCK AND STRONG, Art., *Catechist*. Thus it has always been the order of the Church that the pastor receives the names of all applicants for memberships.

This is the order of the Methodist Episcopal Church. A leader may receive the names of persons on trial, but they must be approved as such by the pastor. ("Baker on the Discipline," p. 29.) This is, no doubt, intended to meet such conditions as the absence of the pastor, or where they may have no pastor at present. But what power have the laity in the reception of members on probation, and into full membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church? Now, the truth is, that the laity in the Methodist Episcopal Church have nearly all the power of determining the character of the Church. The law of the Church is, that no one is to be received, on trial even, unless he is well recommended by one well known, or has met twice or thrice in class.

The first is the rule, but the second will answer as a substitute. The question is here simply what is the law of the Church, not what may be its practice. We come now to the reception of persons into full membership.

In the Discipline we read: "Let no one be

received into the Church [from probation,] until such person has been at least six months on trial, and has been recommended by the leaders and stewards' meeting, or, where no such meeting is held, by the leader." The recommendation of the leaders and stewards' meeting is the law and the rule, and that of the leader is the exception, and will answer. Now, the Discipline does not state, neither is it material, how that recommendation shall be given, either by ballot, voice, show of hands, or rising, or by general consent, so that it is given. Now a large majority of these leaders and stewards are lay members, and unless they recommend the probationer the preacher dare not receive him.

But, notwithstanding this recommendation by this body of laymen, the minister shall publicly examine him, in the presence of the whole Church, as to the correctness of his faith, and willingness to observe and keep the rules of the Church. The preacher asks the whole Church who have listened to the examination, "Have any of you reason to allege why these persons should not be received into full membership in the Church?" The whole Church is to be satisfied as well as the minister. Any one may object, and thus prohibit the minister from receiving any one of them into the Church, simply because they are all to be brothers. So, for the same reason, no man should come into the Church simply upon a majority vote, but by the consent of all, as he does

in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Here is a candidate for membership in a Church. He makes his profession of faith. The vote of the Church on his reception is taken. Suppose two thirds should vote for him, and one third against him. He is now a member of a Church, of which one third of its members are his enemies to begin with. Yet he is a member, and is so by the law of that Church. But it may be said that this seldom or never occurs. But it is the LAW itself, and what can occur according to the law, of which we speak. And if this difficulty is avoided in practice, it is not because the law does not open the way to the difficulty, but because of the general consent of the membership. But this candidate cannot be at peace, knowing that he entered the Church in the face of the protest of one third of its members. But suppose that they should all have grace enough to forgive each other, and love as brethren, would it not have been better to have had that adjustment before he became a member? If the general consent to his membership must be obtained before there can be peace and prosperity, would it not be best to obtain that general consent before he becomes a member? We think so. And this is the plan of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Hence, "Membership in a Christian Church should never depend upon the result of a vote; and yet if any member of the Church is not satisfied with the evidence presented of the moral and Christian char-

acter of the candidate, he should have an opportunity to make objection to his reception."—*Baker on the Discipline*, p. 24. This the Discipline gives. "In no case," says the same author, "should the reception of a person be a matter of public *debate* before the Church. When it is known that objections exist, the reception of the person should be postponed, and private measures adopted which will secure the purity and peace of the Church." This is the language of wisdom. Hence said Dr. Bond: "Our members do not come in by vote, (of the whole Church,) but by the *unanimous consent of all the laity*." And no man should enter any Church as a full member upon any other conditions. If he does, there is a prolific cause of trouble both to himself and in the Society. And if the general consent is obtained, then no vote is needed. Thus we see that in the Methodist Episcopal Church the consent of all the laity is required in the reception of members. We see, also, that at the very foundation of the Church —the receiving of members—the laity hold the balance of power, and the minister is only their servant, for he must receive such, and only such, as they are willing should be received.

Trial and Expulsion of Members.

The door of exit from the Church should be as sacredly guarded as the door of entrance. The Church is a voluntary organization, and no person

can be compelled to remain in it longer than he chooses. But it remains for the religious society to determine whether he has left honorably or dishonorably, whether he is worthy of censure or commendation. But pruning as well as grafting is necessary for the production of good fruit. Our Saviour did not contradict himself when he said, "Let the wheat and tares grow together until the harvest;" and then (in Matthew xviii) he tells us of the steps that must be taken toward our offending brother, and that then, if not reformed, he should "be as a heathen man and a publican." In the first case the wheat and the tares are to grow together in the world, in the same community, but not in the Church. Discipline should not be too rigid nor too lax. If too rigid, injury will be done to the individual; and if too lax, the Church will become corrupt. And the exercise of this discipline should be for one of two purposes: first, the reformation of the guilty; and second, the preservation of the purity of the Church. Evidently, in all church trials, as well as in civil processes, the great object to be attained is justice.

And first it is a part of the constitutional law of the Church that the General Conference, the legislative body, "shall not do away with the privilege of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal: neither shall they do away the privileges of our members of trial before the society

or by a committee, and of an appeal." It is impartial in its operations, as well with the ministry as with the laity. In the interim of the General Conference the bishop, if accused of immorality, may be brought before a committee of elders, his peers in orders, which committee, if in this preliminary trial they find him guilty, may suspend him, subject to a hearing before the Triers of Appeal, and the ensuing General Conference, or a select committee, as they may desire. Similar to this is the trial of a regular minister, as well as a local preacher. He is brought before an investigating committee of his peers, and if found guilty he is suspended, and is held for trial by the Triers to the ensuing session of the body to which he is amenable. And from that body he has the right of appeal to the next higher court. This is in harmony with the proceedings of our civil and criminal courts. A man is arrested, a preliminary trial is held, he is bound over for a hearing at the court above, and the right of appeal is granted. Then how strict is the harmony existing between the mode of trial in the Methodist Episcopal Church and in our civil and criminal courts! Thus the law of the Church secures to each of its accused members an impartial trial by and in the presence of his peers.

Let us now see how this law is applied to the members of the Church. The first form of action is that of complaint, and the member must pay atten-

tion to complaints. He dare not neglect these even at his judgment and pleasure. Says Baker, (p. 95,) "When public rumor accuses a member of having committed a crime, prudential considerations would dictate that the pastor or a committee be appointed to visit the person so accused, and examine the foundation of the reports before any other action is taken. If the reports are evidently unfounded, the member is not mortified by the additional report that he has been arraigned before the Church." And again: "If the committee are painfully convinced that the reports are well founded, they are prepared to state such facts as are necessary for the forming of a correct and proper bill of charges." And again, (p. 96,) "To give no attention to any complaints except such as are presented in due form is to neglect the greatest number of those requiring the special investigation of the Church." The next step is to present a bill of charges, which is made from the complaint rendered.

It is the usage and law of the Church that where a bill of charges, in due form, is presented, the pastor must take the steps necessary for a hearing, as the following from "Baker on the Discipline," p. 115, will prove: "There may be circumstances which would justify a preacher in refusing to entertain a bill of charges, even when signed by respectable members of the Church. In such cases the accusers may, if they deem it proper, complain of the preacher

to his presiding elder, or to the Conference, for neglect of duty; and the presiding elder may remove him from the charge, and the Conference try him for neglect of ministerial duty."

As to modes of trial, there are, perhaps, at least three in practice. The first is that of the Roman Catholic Church, which is simply a priestly excommunication without formal trial; the second is the Congregational, that is, where the case is brought before the whole congregation of members; the third is by a judical committee, either standing or special. It was Wesley's belief and practice that it chiefly pertained to the pastor to receive and exclude members.

Until 1789 the American preachers, respecting the opinion and practice of Wesley in this respect, simply read them in or out of the Society. From 1789 to 1800 the pastor and the laity were considered coordinate in the responsibility of the verdict. In 1796 Bishops Coke and Asbury, in their "Notes on the Discipline," gave it as their opinion that the final judgment should be vested in the minister. Hence, according to this opinion, it was necessary that the pastor remain with the committee to take part in the findings of the court. "Our fathers administered the Discipline on this principle up to the year 1800. It was then provided that the Society, or a select committee, should pronounce an opinion upon the guilt or innocence of the accused; and the

action of the preacher was to be governed by this decision."

According to this latter, and still prevalent view, the entire responsibility of the decision rests upon the committee. The preacher under no circumstances should attempt to balance the evidence, weigh probabilities, determine the credibility of witnesses, or draw inferences from the facts proved, and thus determine disputed questions of fact, even at the request of parties. "No judicious administrator of the Discipline," says Bishop Morris, "will let the committee, or any other person, know his opinion of the case, either before the trial or during its progress, until the committee have made their decision and signed their names to it."—*Baker on the Discipline*, p. 108. See also Discipline.

The offender may be tried before "the Society or a committee." Either form the constitution of the Church declares legal and unalterable. As to the direction of Scripture, there is nothing definite upon the point. The phrase in Matthew, "Tell it to the Church," has been variously interpreted. Calvin says on this expression, that "Christ directs him to be summoned before the tribunal of the Church, that is, the assembly of the elders." And while Barnes regards it as indicating that the offender should be brought before the whole Church, yet he has the liberality to say, "Whether it proves, however, that that is the mode [of trial] which is to be observed

in all instances may admit of a doubt, as the example of the early Churches in a particular case does not prove that that mode has the force of a binding rule upon all." Respecting the incestuous person, spoken of in Corinthians, Calvin says, (*Institutes*, vol. ii, p. 413:) "For Paul not only employs verbal reproof against the Corinthian transgressor, but excludes him from the Church." Hodge regards the Church as convened, not for the purpose of voting or acting in the premises, but "as mere spectators." These we regard as correct and liberal views, and indicate no uniform practice in the Church. But that a man should be tried by and in the presence of his peers is regarded as correct and scriptural in principle, and a trial by a committee or jury is equivalent to a trial by the people.

Right of Appeal.

In the Methodist Episcopal Church, as we have shown from the Discipline, the right of appeal is secured to all the laity and ministry by constitutional provision. There are three parties, either of which may appeal from the decision of the committee: 1. The defendant; 2. The plaintiff; 3. The president of the trial. No committee, as no jury in civil matters, has power to appeal. No matter what may be the verdict, either party has the right of appeal. Is not this republican and Christian? But the minister has also the right to appeal the case.

This is a great principle. By it he may secure the certain punishment of the guilty, who otherwise, because of peculiar circumstances, might go free; or secure acquittal of the innocent, who, for similar reasons, might be unjustly punished. The appeal is taken to the next Quarterly Conference, a body of laymen, and an entirely new court, as the former committee must not be members of this body. Here, then, he has a new judge, the presiding elder, and a new jury. And if the appeal taken by the minister be admitted, the Quarterly Conference has "authority to order a new trial," *ab initio*. And in all other cases of appeal it decides simply upon the evidence sent up from the court below. And a still greater liberty is allowed in cases of appeal. If either party has reasons to believe that he cannot get justice in his own Quarterly Conference, he can appeal to any other in the same district. And at least five sixths of this body have been directly elected by the votes of laymen.

In appealing to the Quarterly Conference he has a new judge, the presiding elder being president of that body. He has also a new court, since the Discipline expressly declares that the committee shall not be members of the Quarterly Conference. This is in some sense a higher court, yet so that he is yet tried by his peers, the laymen. The presiding elder, who presides, is supposed to be a man of superior intelligence, especially as to church economy.

The members of this court, also, are usually among the most pious and intelligent of the Church, and it is expressly required of a portion of them (the stewards) that they shall be persons of "solid piety, who both know and love Methodist doctrine and discipline." It is, then, in these proper and important senses, a higher court. Here he will more likely receive exact justice than before the Church as a mass.

We will now note some points of similarity between the mode of trial in the Methodist Episcopal Church and in our civil courts; and this we do to show the republican nature of its government, and how sacredly it guards the rights of its members.

In some things the first trial of a member before a committee is similar to that before a justice of the peace. He, like the pastor, when complaint is made, gives his opinion whether there is any law, and if so under what one the offender should be arraigned. Like the pastor, he issues the warrant, which is but the notice to appear for trial, and the constable is but his agent in serving the notice, and what is done by his agent is as if done by himself. He, like the pastor, decides all questions of law. He, like the pastor, decides upon the competency of witnesses. He, like the pastor, may appeal to a higher court. There is one point of striking dissimilarity. In this primary court the justice in most cases is both judge and jury. He decides law questions and renders the

verdict. But, as we have shown, the pastor decides questions of law, but the committee alone is responsible for the verdict. Now, as this justice is the judge in this primary court, it is not true, as supposed by some, that the Methodist Episcopal preachers have power above all our judges.

In the higher court, also, there are points of similarity. The judge, like the pastor, presides. The jury, like the committee, (the committee method prevails in all trials in the Methodist Episcopal Church,) renders the verdict. The judge, like the pastor, pronounces the sentence or acquittal. Thus in all cases, from bishops down to laymen, each is entitled to an impartial trial by his peers.

None are to be expelled from the Church except they violate the letter or spirit of the word of God.

There are six general laws under which a private member may be arraigned and expelled, and, while having the form and verbiage of uninspired men, yet they are in strict accordance with the inspired word. The first is for "Immoral Conduct," and before a member can be expelled under the law the crime must be shown to "be such as is expressly forbidden by the word of God."

The second law refers to the "Neglect of the Means of Grace." No one doubts but that the Bible enjoins its own reading, prayer, public worship, and attention to the sacraments and social meetings of a religious kind. And before one is liable to

expulsion under this law his neglect must be willful and persistent.

The third law is against "Imprudent Conduct." Under this are specified "sinful tempers or words; the buying, selling, or using intoxicating liquors as a beverage, . . . and disobedience to the order and Discipline of the Church." The first are certainly forbidden in the word of God. And, referring to Church officers and rules, Paul says, "Obey them that have the rule over you."

The fourth law is against "Dissension." This forbids stirring up strife by inveighing against the doctrines and Discipline of the Church. It does not forbid, as we shall presently show, proper discussion or fair criticism, but ill-tempered and ill-directed speech and actions. Paul says, "I would that they were cut off that trouble you."

The fifth refers to arbitration in case of disagreement in business, before appealing to the law. How much trouble and expense this would save if it were generally followed! Does not the Bible forbid brother going to law with brother, and recommend a reference in its stead?

The sixth refers to "Insolvency." This is a law "against all frauds, and particularly against dishonest insolvencies," and is certainly most appropriate for these times. Certainly the word of God forbids us defrauding one another.

Thus it is seen that these general laws, primarily

applicable to laymen, are all founded upon the law of God. As it respects the General Rules, found in the Discipline, it would be easy to prove what Wesley, their author, says of them: "All which we are taught of God to observe, even in his written word. . . . And all these we know his Spirit writes on truly awakened hearts."

The laws for the trial of preachers are the same in essence and form. The Discipline of the Church provides for the trial of a regular preacher. It has the following five laws for his trial: 1.) Crimes expressly forbidden in the word of God; 2.) Improper tempers, words, or actions; 3.) When he fails in business, or contracts debts which he is not able to pay; 4.) When he holds and disseminates, publicly or privately, doctrines which are contrary to our Articles of Religion; 5.) When he becomes so unacceptable, inefficient, or secular as to be no longer useful in his work. The first prohibits immorality; the second, imprudence; the third, dishonesty; the fourth, heresy; the fifth, worldliness; and the Conference is given power to retire any one when, from any mental or moral defects, he may not be able to discover that he is unacceptable and inefficient. Now, does the word of God forbid immorality, imprudence, dishonesty, heresy, and worldliness? If so, then the Methodist Episcopal Church does not expel her ministers for breaking simply the commandments of men, but the word of God.

CHAPTER XI.

Powers of the Laity: Lay Delegation, Revenues.

METHODISM allows and encourages proper freedom of speech in its ministers and members, but, as shown by Bangs, (vol. i, p. 209,) provision was made, in 1784, in cases of neglect of duties of any kind, imprudent conduct, indulging sinful tempers or words, disobedience to the order and Discipline of the Church, that first, "private reproof" should be given by a leader or preacher, when "if there be an acknowledgment of the fault, and proper humiliation, the person may remain on trial. On a second offense, a preacher may take one or two faithful friends. On a third failure, if the transgression be increased or continued, let it be brought before the Society or a select number; if there be no sign of humiliation, and the Church is dishonored, the offender must be cut off."

No one could find fault with such a proceeding. At the General Conference of 1792 the Discipline was revised, and the following explanation of what was meant by "disobedience to the order and Discipline of the Church was inserted:" "If a member of our Church shall be clearly convicted of endeavoring to sow dissension in any of our Societies by

inveighing against either our doctrine or Discipline, such person so offending shall be first reproved by the senior minister or preacher of his circuit, and if he afterward persist in such pernicious practices he shall be expelled the Society."

This, it will be seen, was the very same in intent and purpose as that adopted by the Conference of 1784, eight years previously. The rule in the Discipline, as it now stands, is the same, with some slight verbal alterations: "If a member of our Church shall be accused of endeavoring to sow dissension in any of our Societies by inveighing against either our doctrine or Discipline, the person so offending shall first be reproved by the preacher in charge, and if he persist in such pernicious practices he shall be brought to trial, and if found guilty expelled."

Thus have we seen that from the very organization of the Church, in 1784, it was provided that members could be expelled for persistent indulgence in improper speech or actions, or willful and impenitent disobedience to the Discipline. Similar provision was also made to meet the case of ministers erring in like manner. At that time no reform movement was mooted in the Church. Hence, such a law was not adopted, as some might think, to prevent proper and free discussion.

But what is the meaning and design of the rule as applied to the laity? What does it prohibit? It

reads: "If a member of our Church shall be accused of *endeavoring to sow dissension* in any of our Societies." Does that mean discussion and investigation? It means to endeavor to create strife and schism in the local Societies. The object had in view by the offender of this rule is not good, but bad.

The rule next shows how the offender is endeavoring to obtain this bad object "by inveighing." Is it discussing or investigating in a proper way that the rule forbids? If so, did they not use a strange word to tell us so? "Inveigh" is a word which in every form has an intemperate meaning. Says Webster, "To exclaim or rail against; to utter censorious and bitter language against; to express reproach." These the rule very properly forbids, as the Bible forbids them.

But, further, the rule forbids "inveighing against either our doctrines or Discipline." This part of the rule is intended to prevent heresy and preserve unity of organization. And the whole rule is designed to keep the Church homogeneous in faith and practice. Without some such rule in every organization, religious or secular, it cannot be perpetuated.

The law prohibits heresy and ecclesiastical treason, and this must not be an incidental or casual offense, but before the offender can be expelled he must persist in the bad practice. And by this law some intemperate antislavery men and radical re-

formers were expelled from the Church. And it is quite possible that in the heat and excitement of those days the law was wrested from its proper design, and improperly applied. During our late unhappy war the National Government stopped more than a hundred presses and stilled more than a thousand tongues. And, doubtless, in some instances the laws against national treason were wrongly enforced. And yet, truly, it is no vain boasting that this is the land above all others of freedom of speech and of the press. So in no Church is more liberal discussion allowed than in the Methodist Episcopal Church. Fair and full criticism of its doctrines, its Discipline, its government, its benevolences, its officers, from the lowest to the highest, may be seen every-where in its widely-extended press.

The truth is, it is one of the most liberal, and at the same time one of the most thoroughly evangelical, Churches in the world. It takes freedom in discussing error wherever found, and it allows equal freedom to others to discuss its errors.

LAY DELEGATION.

The plan allows of two lay delegates for each Annual Conference, excepting such Conferences as have but one ministerial delegate, and they are to have one lay delegate. And these are to be elected by lay delegates sent up from the different charges, at an Electoral Conference, held at the time and place

of the Annual Conference preceding the General Conference.

Rev. Mr. Wheat, a Methodist (Protestant) delegate to the General Conference which approved the measure, (1872,) said before that body: "The point of difference between your and our body may be comprehended in the simple statement that it comprises principles which you have already recognized in the admission of laymen to your ecclesiastical councils." And in the address of the commissioners, (from the same Church,) presented to the same General Conference, they declare: "You have admitted lay delegation into your General Conference." "The introduction of the laity into the highest tribunal of your Church is now a fixed fact; the principle is recognized, and the details connected with its application will, no doubt, sooner or later be adjusted to meet the demands of the Church." Again, says Rev. John Scott, D.D., a former editor of the "Methodist Recorder:" "The right of the laity to representation has been recognized, and the indications are favorable for their admission into all the councils of the Church at a not very distant day." And, further, he says that the General Conference "did recognize and assert the right of some one hundred and twenty-nine laymen to membership in that body on equal terms with the ministry. They were admitted, not as ministers, nor as substitutes for ministers, but as laymen and as the representa-

tives or substitutes of laymen as a class." And because they are elected in a certain way, first as electors by the Quarterly Conference, and then as delegates from the lay Electoral Conference, a few say it is not lay delegation. To this Dr. Scott very wisely replies that a person might as well contend that, because a man had lost his life by falling from a horse, he did not lose it at all, because he did not lose it in some other way—by hanging, for instance—as to contend that, because those laymen were not elected in a particular way to represent the laity, they do not represent them at all. Such fail to discriminate between a thing that is done and the manner in which it is done. "And in admitting them," says the doctor, "their right as the representatives or substitutes of a class to be there, and to have a voice in the government of the Church, was conceded." Such a lay delegation would have been accepted by the Reformers of 1830. Their great champion, M'Caine, said: "Let the local ministry and the laity be represented in the legislative department of the Church. On the other points which we have mentioned above (the episcopacy, presiding eldership, and Annual Conference) we place comparatively no stress. We are not tenacious of them. We are willing, if it be thought best, to relinquish any or all of them."

Again, the commissioners which we have referred to, who came to the Methodist Episcopal General

Conference of 1872, said in their written address: "Had there been in the Methodist Episcopal Church at the time of the controversy the same spirit of compromise, the same disposition to allow free discussion, and grant privileges to the laity, as there now is, it is quite safe to presume that no separate organization would have taken place; that even such lay delegation as you have now accepted, whether fully satisfactory or not, would have been accepted at least as the forerunner of something more desirable, and results would have been different." And they further say: "We believe that sooner or later you will so fully appreciate the wise counsels of the intelligent laymen of your Church as to desire their presence in your Annual as well as General Conferences and provide for their admission." Again: "With the people fully represented in the councils of the Church there is no great danger of oppression from any source." Thus we have proved from these representative men that such a plan of lay delegation as was adopted by the Methodist Episcopal Church would have been accepted by the Reformers. But some would strangely ask for such a representation in the Church as we have in the State. Is this desirable or practicable? Perhaps five sixths of our population are women and children, foreigners and Indians, who are subject to laws, but have no vote nor voice in their making. Besides this, the Church is designed to exist under all governments. Its gov-

ernment is, after all, *sui generis*. What is equal representation? It is an equal number of representatives for an equal number of constituents. And such a lay delegation no Church has. Select from the two classes, ministers and laymen, delegates on this plan, and it would virtually surrender the legislative, judicial, and executive departments —the whole Church—into the hands of the laity. No great Church has such a system of delegation.

Methodist Church polity has not been the growth of a day or week, but the gradual and providential development of years. Historically it is not discreditable that the Church was not represented by the laity in its higher councils in its early years. The first preachers went forth like disciples, not at the call of the people, but to call the people. In their hundred-mile circuits they gathered here and there in the wilderness their little untrained flocks. The preacher was every thing to them. They did not think of rigidly standing up for their rights. They did not ask for a representative other than their pastor. It was needful for the preachers to meet occasionally to consult and arrange their work. They met to make rules for themselves more than laws for the membership. For it will be remembered that the Wesleys had prepared rules by which the Societies were to be governed. And he who will take the time to look will find that the proceedings of the first Annual Conferences in America have

little in them affecting or relating to the laity. The business appertained then, as now, in the Annual Conferences, almost wholly to the ministry. The people so understood it, and they understood it correctly. Hence, when the preachers assembled in the General Conference of 1784, in the city of Baltimore, to organize the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, the laity did not wish to be represented there. They did not make such a request. The preachers and people had been schooled in Wesleyan Methodism, which had never invited the co-operation of the laity in the higher councils of the Church. The people and the preachers were, in the main, satisfied with the Church, its rules and government, as it had been handed down to them molded and fashioned by the hands of the Wesleys and the Wesleyan preachers. Hence that General Conference made very few changes in the rules, and these only to make them apply to the United States, and made little or no change in the polity of the Church. And such an organization of the Church by the ministry gave general satisfaction throughout the membership.

Then we ask, Is it just to censure those preachers for what they did? Under the circumstances what body of men would have acted differently? Is there any tyranny attaching to their proceedings? Was there any design or intention to usurp authority? Unless for the suppression of crime will wise legis-

lators enact laws unasked for or not desired by the people? And instead of the ministry grinding and oppressing the membership by depriving them of their rights, it is a fact of history that they have led the way in securing those rights. The ministry were the first to agitate the subject of the rights of laymen to representation in the General Conference. They have led the reform from the beginning until now. And there has always been a greater ratio of the ministry in favor of lay delegation than the membership. The ministry in this respect have always been in advance of the laity. Let it not be said, then, that it was because "the ministry were afraid to trust the laity" that they have oppressed them and hindered the reform. Until recently a large majority of the membership did not wish to ask for it, and were unwilling to assume its responsibilities. And in the recent vote it was seen that over three fourths of the ministry were in favor of the measure, while not one half of the membership eligible to a vote even asked for the change. And while a few, both of the ministry and laity, during the years of discussion, opposed the principle because of a supposed sacred right of the clergy to govern the Church, the most rejected it because of the presumed lack of expediency.

But all the while there was a visible gradual development of a more liberal polity. The hand of progress never once moved backward on the

Church's dial. If it be thought that the Church was slow in accomplishing the measure, let it be remembered that there were some very good reasons for it. And, first, it was discovered that without lay delegation the Church, in numbers and usefulness, was very rapidly outstripping every other religious body in the land that had or had not lay delegation. Hence why need they change? And, second, those bodies which seceded from the mother Church because of the lack of lay delegation in the Church, having incorporated it in their organization, did not make their expected or satisfactory advancement. Again, why adopt the measure? But another reason why the measure was so long delayed was the frequent loss of so much influence to bring about the proposed change. When O'Kelly withdrew in 1792 the Church lost his personal influence as an eloquent and pious presiding elder, and although nearly all the ministers who withdrew with him returned, yet doubtless we lost many lay members who followed them and never returned. Again, in 1830 the Protestant Methodists seceded, and took out of the Church about eighty preachers and five thousand members. And this was a part of the very element needed in the Church to carry the lay delegation question. Again, in 1843 the Wesleyans withdrew. They led off a large number of the ministry and laity. And although the cause of this secession was not mainly the lack of lay delegation in

the Methodist Episcopal Church, but slavery, yet the influence taken away, like that of 1792, might all be reckoned on the affirmative of the question. Thus, with these frequent and large depletions of the very element needed to change the policy of the Church, and the comparative failure of those bodies that left and made it a prominent feature of their systems, it is no wonder that the measure has been so long delayed in the parent Church. Had these bodies remained faithful to the Church the question would, doubtless, have been carried years ago. And it cannot be shown that their influence separate from the Church aided as much in the consummation of this plan as it would have done in connection with the Church. But we will not reflect upon the past. The Rubicon is crossed. The measure is adopted. Perhaps never in so large a body, civil or ecclesiastical, was there such a vital question brought to such a peaceful and harmonious close. And all the friends of lay delegation rejoice over what has been accomplished.

THE PRIVILEGES AND POWERS OF THE LAITY.

Let the following facts be noted, and the privileges and powers of the laymen in the Methodist Episcopal Church will be found to be immense, and, in many instances, supreme.

None are to be received even on trial without their recommendation and indorsement.

None are to be received into full membership without the sanction of a leader, or a leaders and stewards' meeting, and after this the public consent of the entire membership, male and female.

No one can be expelled from the Church except by a decision of a majority of the laymen before whom he is tried.

An exhorter, before he can have authority to officiate as such, must be recommended and licensed by his fellow-laymen; and he cannot continue to hold that license without the annual indorsement of his brethren.

And no one can receive license as a local preacher, or receive ordination as a local deacon or elder, or retain these prerogatives, except by the yearly concurrence of his lay brethren.

No one can become a traveling or regular minister in the Church without first securing the recommendation of the laymen.

By reviewing these items it will be seen that the moral character of the membership and the ministry in its incipiency are under the control of the laity.

But as it respects the collection and disbursement of the revenues of the Church, the same or similar privileges are enjoyed by the laity. All moneys paid for the erection of churches and parsonages, for the support of the ministry, and for the benevolent agencies of the Church, are voluntary. While each one on becoming a member of the Church volun-

tarily engages to "contribute of his earthly substance, according to his ability, to the support of the Gospel and the various benevolent enterprises of the Church," yet no person or persons have the right to fix an absolute sum, saying how much he shall contribute. The pastor's financial support is simply the aggregation of the individual free-will offerings; and when his salary is fixed by the laity (as it is) he cannot collect it either by civil or ecclesiastical law. Legal taxation or assessments cannot be properly made, and when made are not collectable by statute or Church law. We may voluntarily assume financial burdens, but they cannot be legally imposed. All the financial interests of the Church have for their basal idea the voluntary principle. Therefore, while the laity may withhold and thus oppress the ministry, yet they cannot oppress the laity by the collection of funds for the various moneyed enterprises of the Church.

But in the disbursement of these moneys the laity have, in some instances, supreme authority, and in others have equal and co-ordinate authority with the ministry. In the building of churches and parsonages they have the power of determining what kind of buildings they shall be, wood, brick, iron, marble, or granite; whether the church shall be costly or cheap, with a spire or without one; and they hold the property in trust, not for themselves—for it was not built for that purpose—but for the organ-

ization to which they belong, and of which they are only a factor. And according to the report for 1875 this gives the laity the disbursement and control of about EIGHTY-ONE MILLIONS of dollars' worth of church property.

We next notice the Missionary Society of the Church. Its constitution and charter provide that "the management and disposition of the affairs and property of this society shall be vested in a board of managers, members of the society, consisting of thirty-two laymen and as many ministers." Any person, minister, or layman, becomes a member of the General Missionary Society by the payment of twenty dollars, and thus becomes eligible to election to the Board of Managers. Thus they are equal here to the ministry in the management and disbursement of about six hundred and fifty thousand dollars annually; and we have no doubt that it will rapidly advance to a million.

So the Church Extension Society has a Parent Board, composed of thirty-two laymen and thirty-two ministers, chosen by the General Conference, which is now composed of both ministerial and lay delegates.

The same remarks are true of the Sunday-School, Tract, and Freedmen's Aid Societies. Now, then, the Discipline of the Church provides for committees of laymen to collect these funds, and, as we have seen above, the constitutions of these societies pro-

vide for an equal number of them in the management and disbursement of these funds, and not one dollar of these moneys is disbursed by the Annual Conferences. Hence, as we have shown, the laity by committees collect the money, and by an equal representation in the Board of Managers in all our societies, equally disburse the money. The only money disbursed by the Annual Conference is that for the superannuated ministers. This is not an organized society or board of the Church. If it were —and it would be if thought needful by the General Conference—it would undoubtedly be constituted on the same principle of equality as the above societies. Instead of this, each Annual Conference appoints a committee to disburse these funds and to read their report before the Conference, and any interested person can come before that committee and make any statement he thinks proper. And as this money is to be dispensed to ministers, it would seem proper that the committee should be ministers. But instead of this, in deference to the truthfulness and financial ability of the laymen, the Annual Conference appoints a committee of an equal number of ministers and laymen to wisely disburse this fund. Thus the powers of the laymen over the revenues of the Church are in all cases equal, and in many cases superior, to the powers of the ministry.

Thus it will be seen that the laity determine the character of the Church. As in the State, so in the

Church, the people—the laity—hold the balance of power. They decide who is fit to enter, and who is unfit to remain. O how great is this responsibility! There is certainly nothing in all this inimical to free institutions. It is in harmony with the principle underlying our political fabric, which is that in this nation the people rule.

CHAPTER XII.

Women's Work in the Church.

THE Jewish idea of human beneficence seems to have been restricted as to its objects; and this limitation, for a time at least, was of divine warrant. The little good that was then in the world needed to be carefully preserved and protected. Too much diffusion might have proved its destruction; too great an exposure at this, so early, a period, might have caused its premature death. The embryo needs its covering, and the kernel its shell, and the seed its sack, to protect the germinal life; so the Gospel, as a germinal idea, existed for so long a time wrapped up, secured by this apparent, not to say real, exclusiveness. And this appeared necessary, preliminary, and preparatory, for a certain and future unfolding. The Gospel is that seed bursting its shell, shooting up its stalk and trunk, and extending far and wide its umbrageous branches, and in whose inviting and refreshing shade the scattered tribes of earth may gather in sweetest fellowship. And in the watering, pruning, cultivating, of this gospel-tree, both reason and Scripture indicate that woman is to take an important part.

It is neither best nor safe to wholly commit the

literature of a nation to either sex; neither one of which would keep it pure. Among the Greeks and Romans the literature was composed by men and for men, and the classical student well knows how difficult it is to recite Sophocles and Homer, and some parts of Livy, in a mixed class. Shakspeare was the master *litterateur* of the English race, yet he has many lines that could not with propriety be either read in families or recited in public. He, a man, wrote for men. Let women edit papers and publish books side by side with men, and let each know that what each publishes is to pass under the eyes of the other, and this method will tend to correct and purify the literature of the world. And while we mean by this no reflection upon either the ability or purity of the publishing interests of the Church, yet that they may be even more efficient we would have our women connected with every department thereof. As to the periodical, she will now and then, at long intervals, venture to send in a short communication, accompanied with a silent prayer that it may not go into the waste-basket. Of the Church's hundreds and thousands of tracts intended for home and foreign missionary distribution, few or none of them are written by women. And if we intend to reach the women in heathen lands largely through the agency of women there is a change needed here. Let these tracts go into their hands bearing the imprint of sisters; telling the story of

such as have been rescued, elevated, and sanctified through the Gospel of Christ. Such a course would inspire hope like this: "If that Gospel will do so much for woman in America it may do something for women in India." There is abundance of talent in the Church, and already there is the beginning of this desired change.

The secular, as well as the religious, teaching of the age is rapidly passing into the hands of woman. Three fourths of all our day and Sabbath-school teachers are women. A large share of the contributions to our Sunday-school papers is from women. Nearly all of our recent Sunday-school books are from their pens. This we cannot regard as an accident, but as a providential development, which carries with it the pronounced verdict that woman is the best instructor of the youth; and we apprehend that when once freed from the fetters of false public opinion she will arise and show herself the equal of her brother in the instruction of the old; for rest assured that, argue against it as we will, and deplore it as we may, half smile and half scorn at it perchance, yet it is manifest destiny that soon the motto of Oregon will be her motto, *Alis volat propriis*—"She flies with her own wings." And why not? Why may she not be eminently successful there? If, like Vinnie Ream, she can carve out the bust of one of the most honorable of American statesmen, why can she not carve out the destiny of an immortal soul? If,

like Christine Nilssen, she can entrance the listening thousands with the songs of the world, why can she not inspire with hope the hearts of her heathen sisters with the songs of salvation? And if, like Ristori and Siddons, Olive Logan and Anna Dickinson, she can entertain the multitudes from the platform, why may she not, like Anna the prophetess, instruct the people from the pulpit? And if her services are as acceptable and as successful as her brother's, why is not her head as worthy of the imposition of consecratory hands as her brother's? And if parchment is of value in the one case, why is it not of value in the other? And if she is to be denied this privilege for the lack of a "Thus saith the Lord," then, to be consistent, tear her away from the communion rail. It is high time that the Churches were done with that false idea that the New Testament furnishes a definite and invariable model of church polity for all peoples and for all times.

Thus empowered, how eminently successful might woman be in heathen families! To these she finds more ready, and often more proper, access than her brother; and how much more impressive might her services be, if there she should find Lydia's household, and administer unto them the rites of the Christian Church! Thus authorized, she could more certainly meet and overcome some of the most fatal errors in the heathen mind, which lie hidden like some dangerous rocks in the depths of the sea.

Among the Hindu proverbs may be found the following, relating to woman: "Ignorance is a woman's jewel;" "Female wisdom is from the evil one;" "The feminine qualities are four, ignorance, fear, shame, and impunity." The proverbs of a nation express briefly the national sentiment. Now, then, this sentiment must be changed before there can be much hope for the elevation and salvation of heathen women. Who can better change this sentiment than enlightened and authorized woman? Let her show her heathen sisters, by precept and example, that not ignorance and degradation, but intelligence and virtue, are the crowning jewels of woman. She can show her sisters that the Bible is more excellent than the Vedas; that the Cross is more powerful than the Crescent.

Now, then, "The Woman's Foreign Missionary Society," in its spirit, is not new in the Church; only in its formal organization is it new. Like the Gospel, Methodism has, from its origin, recognized the public services of woman in the Church.

Wesley, like Paul, had many faithful women who earnestly labored with him in the Gospel of Christ; and we know that by his recognition of them as leaders of classes, and by their public exhortations and prayers, he shocked the staidness of many high-churchmen. The Church's history is graced with a long and honored catalogue of moral heroines. And we utter it as no uncertain prophecy that the time is

near at hand when that Church which continues to dampen the public ardor of woman, and to ignore her public efforts, will have Ichabod written upon its walls. And for one we rejoice in the organization of the "Woman's Foreign Missionary Society." We regard it as the uncovering of a mighty arm of power to the Church. From this field we shall look for a glorious harvest. It is worthy of a generous support. Its means will be wisely expended.

But what is woman's work for Jesus at home? Many say that woman's sphere is the *home* sphere. While there is abundance to be done abroad, there is still abundance to be done at home. What can she do in these Christian lands, in these Christian communities, for Jesus? There is much work to be done which, if not done by her, will either not be done at all, or be but poorly done. Upon the Christian mother depends first almost wholly the religious instructions of the young. The duties of the father and husband are usually of such a kind as to call him away from the household the most of the day, and often, also, during the earlier hours of the evening. It seems inevitable that the chief care of the children, at least for their earlier years, will come upon the mother. Men may do much to lessen this care, yet the burden of it will still be upon her.

Again, as first impressions are most lasting as a rule, then the children of the country will be what the mothers choose to make them; or, neglecting

their duty, let the children take their chances for becoming either good or evil; and with their born tendencies, nurtured by evil associations, the result will very generally be against morality. It is now very generally conceded that all reforms, to be greatly successful, must be commenced with the children. And to do this work home-life must be so arranged and systemized as to give time and place for it regularly, or it will be generally neglected. O, what a great work is here that *may* be done, that *ought* to be done, that *can* be done for Jesus!

But is woman's life-mission all accomplished even if she meets all the obligations of her home? Are the sacred precincts of her home the boundaries of her responsibility? No, not even if every woman did her whole duty in her home. As it now is, and is likely to continue for some time, there are many who fail in these duties, and must be helped by those who succeed. That sentiment which says, "Let every home take care of itself," is not right any more than is that sentiment which says, "Let every man take care of himself."

Every Christian woman should be a Christian pastor. We do not desire that the pastor of the Church should escape, in this way, his responsibility. But it is a fact, evident to every reflecting mind, that no minister can do all this good work and also meet the other increasing responsibilities of the pulpit and daily life. Either his pastoral work must

suffer, or his pulpit preparations and other necessary literary labor must suffer. As the best way, then, we suggest female sub-pastors to assist in this department of his work.

But it may be asked if we have not sub-pastors already in the person of the elder, deacon, or leader. True, we have; but even they fail to do all that ought to be done. The truth is, and needs to be plainly stated, that there are many places that need religious counsel where none but a woman can properly go. There are the fallen that might be restored by the potent influence of Christian women. There are sick-beds she may visit, to speak words of sweetest comfort. As a rule, perhaps, there is *visiting* enough, but there is not enough of the right kind, nor at the most needy places. There is *talk* enough; but is it enough about Jesus? Suppose, for example, that you, a woman, think of a family where there is a sick mother, daughter, or child. There is trouble there. You take your Bible, look up those portions most suitable to the case, and go to see them. You take your chair by the bedside; inquire how they are; turn the subject nicely to religious matters; talk kindly to them, and, with Bible in hand, read those selections; then sing, as only a woman can sing, and then pray, as only a woman can pray, and would not the blessing of God come down on that family? This you can do for Jesus. Remember, your work is not confined to your own home.

But what is woman's work for Jesus in Church service? Well, there she may sing, says one. Thank God for that! We believe that all Christian people allow her that privilege but the Quakers, and they will not let the men sing. In that they are consistent, if not right. Yes, she may sing for Jesus without let or hinderance. May she pray? Some say, Yes; but a great many say, No. She may sing in public for Jesus, but she must not pray in public for Jesus! Much of what is sung is thanksgiving and supplication, and this is what prayer is; the only real difference is, that in prayer our words are not prolonged, as in song. Why is it right for her to *sing* words of prayer in the public congregation, and wrong for her to *pray* words of prayer in the public congregation? As she can, as a rule, sing with more effect than man, so, as a rule, she can pray with more touching effect than man. Let her pray, then.

But let her also speak for Jesus in the love-feast or in the conference room. Why not? When Jesus, through the Gospel, has done so much for woman, shall she not speak of his wondrous love? Shall the tongues of the Marthas and Marys, and the widows of Nain, and other faithful women, be silent in the assembly of the Master? When the Gospel has broken open the doors to her hateful seclusion, and brought her forth unvailed to the world, and made her the inspired symbol of the sanctified Church,

shall she not then openly speak and pray for Jesus? Two thirds of the Church membership of to-day are women. Yet how many of them are efficient workers for Jesus? Can it be that this large number has done all that is for them to do when they go to church and sing for Jesus? Will it do for you to say that "I have enough to do at home?" Why cannot men of business say the same? Will it do to say you have no ability, no talent? Neither would man have talent if he were not brought out and trained. But the temperance crusade has shown that women *have* talent, and they only need a fair opportunity for its development and exercise.

But you must read, study, and pray for assistance to work for Jesus. O that God would teach us how best to utilize this vast latent force of the Church! We know it will be a cross, but must not you bear the cross, too? You will feel that you cannot do this work. We would to God that all the women, young and old, were mightily moved to work and speak for Jesus. And in our heartfelt anxiety for woman's greater usefulness let not the thought be indulged a moment that we do not fully appreciate her eminent services in the past. Methodism in its incipiency and development owes very much to her wise counsels and encouraging labors. Says Stevens: "Wesley's incorporation of female agency in his practical system has been one of the most effective causes of the surprising success of Method-

ism. Its history presents a long list of women whose names have become household words in the families of the denomination, and whose memories the Church will never let die. They rank from the higher circles of life, in which were Susanna Wesley, related to the Earls of Anglesea; Selina, Countess of Huntingdon, remotely connected with the royalty of England; Lady Fitzgerald, of the British Court; Lady Maxwell, Lady Glenorchy, and others, down to the humble but saintly Hester Ann Rogers; Dinah Evans, the heroine of one of the ablest of English fictions—the Dairyman's Daughter, a title dear to Christian households in all lands; and Barbara Heck, the obscure foundress of American Methodism, venerated throughout a continent."

Again, says the same historian: "Their activity, organized by Wesley, continues to promote its progress vigorously in all its fields. Occasionally they still appear in the more public labors which were exemplified by Mary Fletcher, Hester Ann Rogers, and Grace Murray; the more ample growth of the regular ministry has, however, relieved them of such services; but as Sunday-school teachers, academic teachers, and missionaries, they form a numerous body of Church laborers.

"In the social services of Methodism, perhaps its most distinctive and effective means of success, its class-meetings, love-feasts, and prayer-meetings, their power is universally prevalent in our day. In

almost every church of the denomination, in the city, or the humblest village and remotest neighborhood, they may be heard every week, among our chief witnesses for the faith. They also toil in innumerable forms of benevolent usefulness, often noiselessly, but none the less efficiently. They even take the lead in various philanthropic enterprises. Methodism far transcends Quakerism in the extent and effectiveness of the activity of its women. In fine, its early example in this respect has influenced its whole career down to the present day, and now awakens the brightest promise for the future.

"The women of the second century of American Methodism enter upon their privileges and responsibilities in the light of the pure examples and the successful efforts of the past. While their privileges are greatly multiplied, they can clearly see, from the history of those who have gone before them, that their own labor will not be in vain in the Lord. While, then, the Church may well rejoice over its record of devout women, both in its earlier and later history, it may confidently look to those at present within its pale to hand down similar examples and influences to generations following."

Woman's work in the Church, to be the most efficient, must be co-operative with the high mission of the regular ministry. She is man's copartner in life, and in this not less so than in any other relation or vocation in life, at home or abroad.

"Unwearied to watch by a moral grave,
Alone intent on the work to save;
For Christ to suffer all earthly loss,
Yet firm to uphold the hallowed cross;
Through fire and flood, be it Heaven's decree
To pass—wilt thou share this lot with me?"

THE REPLY.

"Is there a danger I might not share,
A sorrow with thee that I could not bear?
Nor perils around me, nor griefs from above,
Can rival the might of deathless love.
In the flood, in the flame, no terrors I see—
I go for my Lord, and I go with thee.

"In panoply armed to the world unknown,
We'll brave the conflict, and hope for the crown;
Hope be our anchor, the vail within,
And our bliss the souls that for Christ we win.
I hear his voice o'er the distant sea,
And I come to the help of the Mighty with thee."

CHAPTER XIII.

Liberality of Doctrine.

HAVING spoken of the liberality of discipline, let us now speak of the liberality of doctrine.

In 1743, when Wesley was forty years of age, he published "The General Rules" for his Societies, in which he said: "There is only one condition previously required of those who desire admission into these Societies, 'a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins.' But wherever this is really fixed in the soul, it will be shown by its fruits. It is therefore expected of all who continue therein, that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, First, By doing no harm, by avoiding evil of every kind, especially that which is most generally practiced. . . . It is expected of all who continue in these Societies that they should continue to evidence their desire of salvation, Secondly, By doing good . . . of every possible sort, and, as far as possible, to all men. . . . Thirdly, By attending upon all the ordinances of God." This, we believe, is as liberal as the Gospel. It receives the man who has nothing more than a true *desire* to be saved. It extends to him a helping hand just at the opening of the path-way to salvation. And if ever there is a

time when he needs the help of the Church it is then; and without this timely assistance and waiting for him to become a true believer before his reception, he might hopelessly sink into the quagmire of discouragement. And, not simply resting upon a professional desire, the Church looks for the appropriate fruit in his after life. Here, it will be seen, no religious opinions are necessary before admission into these Societies. Concerning this Wesley wrote in his eighty-fifth year, after this condition had been in force for about forty-five years: "There is no other religious society under heaven which requires nothing of men in order to their admission into it but a desire to save their souls. Look all around you, you cannot be admitted into the Church or Society of the Presbyterians, Anabaptists, Quakers, or any others, unless you hold the same opinions with them, and adhere to the same mode of worship. The Methodists alone do not insist on your holding this or that opinion, but they think and let think. . . . Now, I do not know any other religious society, either ancient or modern, wherein such liberty of conscience is now allowed, or has been allowed, since the age of the apostles."

But it must not be inferred from this that Methodism has no doctrinal system or theological opinions. She has a sound and profound theology. But a set form of orthodoxy has never been the chief aim and glory of the Church. In his "Short His-

tory of Methodism," Wesley says, that in 1738 he "and a few other clergymen, who all appeared to be of one heart as well as of one judgment, resolved to be Bible Christians at all events; and, wherever they were, *to preach with all their might plain, old, Bible Christianity.*" This has always been a peculiarity of Methodism, and never was it more needed than now. It has never aimed to establish ecclesiastical dogmas. Its mission is more spiritual. Wesley wrote in 1744 in his "Appeal to Men of Reason and Religion:" "This religion we long to see established in the world, a religion of love, and joy, and peace, having its seat in the inmost soul, but ever showing itself by its fruits, continually springing forth not only in all innocence, for love worketh no ill to his neighbor, but likewise in every kind of beneficence, spreading virtue and happiness all around."

As to the relative value of opinion and practice, of form and life, he said in the following year: "They do, indeed, hold right opinions; *but they are peculiarly cautious not to rest the weight of Christianity there.* They have no such overgrown fondness for any opinions as to think those alone will make them Christians, or to confine their affection or esteem to those who agree with them therein. There is nothing they are more fearful of than this, lest it should steal upon them unawares. . . . They contend for nothing trifling, as if it were important; for nothing indifferent, as if it were necessary; for nothing

circumstantial, as if it were essential to Christianity; but for every thing in its own order." May Methodists every-where and forever prove themselves worthy of this descriptive honor by their liberal founder!

Still imbued with the same principles, in 1748 he wrote his "Plain Account of the People called Methodists," in which he says that about ten years before he and his brother began to preach in many parts of London. "The points we chiefly insisted upon were, first, that orthodoxy, or right opinions, is at best but a very slender part of religion, if it can be allowed be to any part of it at all; that neither does religion consist in negatives; . . . that it is nothing short of the image of God stamped upon the heart; inward righteousness, attended with the peace of God and joy in the Holy Ghost." It would be very easy to multiply quotations of the same sort, but perhaps none could be more explicit.

To feel the full force of Wesley's judgment as to the comparative value of doctrine and practice, we should remember that those declarations which we have given were the utterances, not of a man of shallow learning, but of a man of varied and vast culture. When we consider the itinerancy of his life, and the numerous cares crowding upon him from all points, we are surprised at his abundant literary and religious productions. He was a man, also, able to grapple with the ablest in discussions of abstruse ques-

tions of theology. And upon these subjects, when occasion required, he showed himself not a pupil, but a master; and his polemics to-day, with all our advanced thought upon religious subjects, are no inferior armory from which to draw serviceable weapons in controversy.

But again, Wesley lived in a day when the Church of England, as it always has been, was strong in its orthodoxy. The sermons of the clergy were learned and logical. But while they were thus preaching, Bishop Burnet saw "imminent ruin hanging over the Church," and Watts was writing that "religion was dying out in the world." And Wesley saw that the world was spiritually sinking under a rigid orthodoxy. Hence he said to his preachers: "The best method of preaching is, 1. To convince; 2. To offer Christ; 3. To invite; 4. To build up; and to do this in some measure in every sermon." Can any professor of didactic theology in this day furnish a better method? In all of his one hundred and forty published sermons there is very little of abstract theology.

Wesley never gave a formal creed to his Societies in Great Britain. He said, in 1744: "Now, all I teach respects either the nature and condition of justification, the nature and condition of salvation, or the Author of faith and salvation." His anomalous position toward the Church of England, maintained until the close of his life, doubtless prevented

this. Indeed, it was scarcely necessary for him to formulate a creed for his Societies in England, since he believed that he taught no doctrine that was not supported by the standards of the Established Church. And in the language of Dr. Abel Stevens, referring to Methodism: "Not a single doctrine did it announce, or does it yet proclaim, that was not sanctioned by the standards of the Anglican establishment."

But he did give a formula of faith for the American Methodists in 1784, when they were about to organize a Church. This he could do consistently with his opinions concerning the relation he sustained to the Church of England. He saw that by the result of the war—the independence of the country, ecclesiastically as well as politically—"the case was widely different between England and North America." Hence for the American Church he abridged and emended the Articles of Religion of the Established Church. He eliminated the relics of popery, and those parts supposed by some to favor high Calvinism. But he added nothing to them. It seems strange that he did not even insert those doctrines most emphasized by himself and his preachers, such as justification by faith, the witness of the Spirit, and Christian perfection. His own catholicity suggested that a Church's creed should be brief and most general in its statements of doctrine. And thus these Articles remain in the Meth-

odist Discipline to-day. And we would add no more particulars to them, but rather simplify and generalize them even more. They are the only officially recognized formula of faith in the Church. The General Rules, it is true, are believed to be founded upon the word of God, but they do not stand so much as a symbol of faith as governing principles for private life. And the Church still retains the "one condition" for admission, "a desire to flee from the wrath to come, and to be saved from their sins." True, when the candidate comes forward for full admission he is asked to assent to this general formula of faith, the Articles of Religion, very much as a member of the Evangelical Alliance is asked to subscribe to its general formula. He is not asked whether he believes in any emphasized doctrines of the Wesleyan theology or not, and for even disbelieving these he is not liable to excommunication. True, he can be expelled for "sowing dissensions in the Society by inveighing against" the doctrines of the Church; but this does not refer so much to the kind of opinions held, as to the spirit and manner of holding and disseminating them.

Respecting the ministry, as it regards his opinions or doctrines, no one can be expelled unless he preaches "doctrines which are contrary to our Articles of Religion." It is presumed, of course, that he will preach according to the doctrines taught in the course of study prescribed by the Church. Yet

whatever changes may or may not occur in his theological opinions, according to the letter and laws of the Church he cannot be suspended until he preaches doctrines averse to the Articles of Religion. He may preach many things not taught in them, but he must preach nothing contrary to them. And we believe, such is their simplicity and catholicity, that, without serious embarrassment of opinion, the evangelical Protestantism of the whole world can stand together upon them. And who does not admire the liberality of Wesley in giving such a symbol of faith to the American Church, as well as admire the liberality of that people that has perpetuated it almost verbally in spite of all the varied theological controversies of more than a hundred years!

During all those changeful years the Church, true to the principles of its founder, has cared less for orthodoxy than spiritual life. It still thinks and lets think. "Methodism, in fine, reversed the usual policy of religious sects who seek to sustain their spiritual life by their orthodoxy; it has sustained its orthodoxy by devoting its chief care to its spiritual life, and for more than a century has had no serious outbreaks of heresy, notwithstanding the masses of untrained minds gathered within its pale, and the occasional lack of preparatory education among its clergy. No other modern religious body affords a parallel to it in this respect." "Let us

venture to hope for an early dawn of that day so much anticipated and so anxiously wished for by so many and such earnest spirits of our time, in which new and rich outpourings of the Holy Ghost will put an end to the intolerable disagreements of the old Churches and creeds, and reveal the kingdom of God in power and great majesty."

CHAPTER XIV.

Methods of Propagandism.

WE do not design speaking of those means of success which are more or less special to Methodism —such as its itinerancy, its revival meetings, its peculiar means of grace, its positive Christian experience, its direct preaching, its emphasis of certain doctrines—but rather of its common and organized methods of diffusion. And we mention, first,

ITS MISSIONARY SYSTEM.

John Wesley was born a missionary. He felt himself not only permitted but called to step outside, in many respects and instances, the ecclesiastical boundaries of his day. Even before his conversion he was so impressed with the especial mission of his life that he embarked for Georgia, and spent two years in America for the purpose of missionary labor among the North American Indians. Returning to his native country, and receiving the baptism of the Spirit, he soon began to travel through England, Ireland, and Scotland; and whether preaching in the churches or chapels, upon the corners of the streets or in Moorfields, upon a platform or upon his father's tombstone, his meaning and utter-

ance was, "The world is my parish." He did not feel himself called so much to establish a sect as, like an apostolic evangel, to "spread scriptural holiness through these lands." His spiritual children were born with the spirit of their father. They soon began to traverse Great Britain and Ireland from one extreme to the other, and their missionary zeal soon overleaped the boundaries of their native country. And one Robert Williams, a local preacher—with his saddle-bags, a bottle of milk, a loaf of bread, but no money—embarked for the wilds of America in 1769, seven years before the Declaration of Independence. A fellow Methodist passenger paid his passage. He is said to have been the first minister in America that published a book, the first that married, the first that located, and the first that died. True it is that nine years before this Philip Embury and his company landed in New York, and he is recognised as the first class leader and local preacher of Methodism on the American continent; but it does not appear that he and his colony came prompted mainly, if indeed at all, by a missionary spirit. However, by his preaching in that city, and the helpful labors of Barbara Heck, a little Society was formed, and the result of their labors has fixed the epoch of Methodism in America in 1766.

In the year 1769, however, Wesley sent to America two regular itinerant preachers, Boardman and Pilmoor. Besides Williams, other local preachers

were in the field rendering valuable service, such as King, Strawbridge, and Captain Webb; but the above two were the first directly sent out by Wesley. In the next year America is officially recognized by him as a mission field, having four missionaries, Williams, King, Boardman, and Pilmoor; and the next year the membership is given as three hundred and sixteen. In this year, 1771, he sent over two others, Francis Asbury and Richard Wright, the former one to become the chief of the apostles of American Methodism. What Wesley was to England Asbury was to be to America. Says one: "His labors in the New World were, if possible, greater than those of Wesley in the Old; he traveled more miles a year and preached as often. The history of Christianity since the apostolic age affords not a more perfect example of ministerial and episcopal devotion than was presented in this great man's life. His success placed him unquestionably at the head of the leading characters of American ecclesiastical history. No one man has done more for Christianity in the Western hemisphere."—*Stevens.* It is not necessary for us to portray his marvelous labors. From East to West, from North to South, he annually traversed the settled part of the Continent. He was indeed a missionary bishop.

We need hardly speak of Dr. Coke, the deputed organizer of the Methodist Episcopal Church. His extreme devotion to the missionary interests of

Methodism is known and read of all Christendom, and his praise is in all the Churches. Many know how that in his old age, still full of apostolic zeal, he embarked for a distant land at his own cost, to organize the mission forces; and that before reaching his destination he ceased at once to work and live; and that now his body sleeps in the swinging hammock of the ocean's waves.

How could the Methodist Church in the United States, organized and officered by such men, be any other than a missionary Church? It was the great pioneer Church. For over fifty years after its epochal year, 1766, its labors were mainly missionary labors. During these years the itinerants were pursuing the emigrant settlers of the frontier, and teaching in the cabins of the plantations, and everywhere organizing and establishing Churches. Every preacher was a home missionary. But as the population of the country rapidly increased they felt the need of organized effort in this direction. Many of the Churches were now well established, and were able and willing to contribute something more than the mere support of their own local Church—something toward the support of the poorly fed and clothed pioneer preacher. Hence the Missionary Society was organized in 1819. During the following twelve years the Church devoted its surplus energies to the home field, and for this special missionary work contributed an aggregate of over

$71,000. But the missionary zeal of the Church could not long be satisfied even with the broad expanse of the American Continent. Hence, in 1832, the foreign field was taken into the scope of its operations, and Melville B. Cox sailed for Africa the same year, the first foreign missionary of American Methodism. Soon after having organized the Liberia Mission he fell, a martyr to its climate.

It is not our design to give a detailed history of the missionary movements of the Church; we can only epitomize or summarize the results. Besides its wonderful expansion at home, the Church has in a little over forty years established and maintained missions in twelve different foreign nations, as follows: Africa, South America, India, China, Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Bulgaria, Italy, Mexico, and Japan. And in five of these mission fields the work is so far advanced as to be formally organized into respectable conferences; these are India, China, Germany, Scandinavia, and Liberia. In these various foreign fields are now more than 207 missionaries; assistant missionaries, 162; teachers, 310; members, 16,127; 111 church edifices, valued at $396,171; 55 parsonages, valued at $70,750; 426 Sunday-schools; 18,971 scholars; native male helpers, 72; deaconesses, 13; day-schools, 180, with 5,329 pupils.

In this short period of time there have also been established publishing houses in the following for-

eign nations: Germany, at Bremen; Sweden, at Gottenburg; the city of Mexico; China, at Foochow; and India. And from these houses issue many valuable books, periodicals, and tracts, for the evangelization of those countries.

In 1869 "The Woman's Foreign Missionary Society" was organized as an aid to this foreign work. During its eight years of existence it has increased the number of its associations to 1,839, and its membership to 54,160; and is publishing a paper entitled "Heathen Woman's Friend." It has in the field nineteen missionaries, has established one hundred schools, has employed one hundred and eight Bible women and teachers, supports one hundred and fifty-nine orphans, and contributed last year about $56,000 for missions.

But while the Church has been doing so much in foreign lands, it has not been negligent of home missionary work. It looks after the foreign population, that is so rapidly pouring in upon our shores. Among these it now has 251 missionaries, 439 local preachers, over 40,000 members, and 560 churches, valued (exclusive of parsonages) at $1,944,250. It has been rapidly establishing missions among the native population as well. In these domestic missions it has now employed not less than 2,307 missionaries. Thus, while the Church heeds the Macedonian cry for help, she also lends a listening ear and a helping hand to those who are at her doors. For

the Parent Missionary Society there was raised, in 1875, $603,740. Add to this the amounts raised for Church Extension, Tracts, Sunday-schools, Freedmen, Bible Society, and the Woman's Foreign Missionary Society, (and these are all primarily missionary agencies,) and we have the grand sum of about $873,000, besides permanent loans and legacies and outside donations. And while the amounts contributed may vary because of the varying financial condition of the country, yet it is evident that the missionary spirit of the Church was never purer and stronger than to-day. And whatever changes of missionary policy, especially with reference to the foreign fields, may take place, it must not be inferred as indicating a loss of missionary zeal in the home Church. Whenever we begin to lose our missionary zeal we will begin to decline.

THE SUNDAY-SCHOOL AGENCY.

Methodist historians give Methodism the fatherhood of Sunday-schools. Tyerman, in his "Life of Wesley, (vol. i, p. 10,) says: "Sunday-schools are now an important appendage of every Church, and have been a benefit to millions of immortal souls; but it deserves to be mentioned that Hannah Ball, a young Methodist lady, had a Methodist Sunday-school at High Wycombe fourteen years before Robert Raikes began his at Gloucester; and that Sophia Cooke, another Methodist, who afterward became

the wife of Samuel Bradburn, was the first who suggested to Raikes the Sunday-school idea, and actually marched with him at the head of his troop of ragged urchins the first Sunday they were taken to the parish church." This the same author seems to prove in his second volume, (p. 534,) where he shows that in 1765 Miss Ball was one of the chief members of the Wesleyan Society at the above-named place, and that in 1770 she wrote: "The children meet twice a week—every Sunday and Monday. They are a wild little company, but seem willing to be instructed. I labor among them earnestly, desiring to promote the interests of the Church of Christ." Wesley adopted and patronized the Sunday-school idea. He observed with pleasure their rapid multiplication, and in the spirit of prophecy, as early as 1784, said: "I find these schools springing up wherever I go. Perhaps God may have a deeper end therein than men are aware of. Who knows but some of these schools may become nurseries for Christians!" "Nurseries for Christians," indeed! This prophetic phrase has gone wherever the Sunday-school has gone, and the world is realizing its fulfillment more and more from day to day. Wesley loved even the sight of a Sunday-school, and the singing of the children was to him an inspiration. At Bolton, in 1788, he met about a thousand Sunday-school children from different schools, and he says: "I never saw such a sight before. They were

all exactly clean, as well as plain in apparel. All were serious and well behaved. Many, both boys and girls, had as beautiful faces as I believe England or Europe can afford. When they all sung together, and none of them out of tune, the melody was beyond that of any theater; and what is the best of all, many of them truly fear God, and some rejoice in his salvation." To appreciate this statement we should remember that at this time Wesley was in the eighty-fifth year of his age. Blessed youthful old man!

Very early in American Methodism this good cause was recognized. The Annual Conference of 1779 ordered that the preachers should meet the children once in two weeks for religious instruction. This, it will be seen, was also prior to the efforts of Raikes in England in 1783. In the year 1786 Bishop Asbury organized a Sunday-school at the house of Thomas Crenshaw, Hanover County, Virginia. This, says Peck, in his "History of the Great Republic," was "the first Sunday-school proper on the Western Continent." The Conference of 1790 said: "Let us labor as the heart and soul of one man to establish Sunday-schools in or near the place of public worship," in order to teach poor children, white and black, "learning and piety." Coke and Asbury, in their Notes on the Discipline, published in 1796, urge the preachers to meet the children weekly, and to "establish Sabbath-schools, wherever practicable,

for the benefit of the children of the poor." It was not, however, until 1828 that this agency of the Church was formally organized; and even after this its efficiency was greatly crippled by an attempt to amalgamate the Bible and Tract Societies with it. Indeed, the Sunday-school was nearly, if not wholly, smothered in this combination. But in 1840 it took a new departure. Then, isolated and alone, the "Sunday-School Union" of the Church was organized, and from a new impulse started on a new career of usefulness. And under the successive leadership of such accomplished men as Durbin, Kidder, Wise, and Vincent, it is now sweeping onward to a grand future. And, says the author of the "Great Republic:" "It requires, therefore, no great sagacity to see that the institution has already become a part and a mode of the national life; that it has ceased to be experimental and has become historical; and that both those who make and those who write history must recognize this vitalizing force of the modern ages. . . . The Sunday-school is one grand reliance for the Christian culture of freemen and the constitution of a pure, exalted statesmanship. . . . Let American statesmen and philanthropists cherish the Sunday-school." It would be difficult to estimate the work that Methodism has done in her Sunday-schools during the past century in laying the foundation of a pure statesmanship in this Republic. Being as to time foremost in this good

work, and the first Conferences being under the rules of Wesley, one of which required the preacher to "visit from house to house," and the other to "diligently instruct the children in every place," we may suppose that those people did a vast work, elementary though it be, for the Christian civilization of the Republic during its first hundred years.

And what is the Church now doing in this respect? Admitting the common inaccuracy of statistics, yet the following facts and figures are the best evidence of the vastness of the operations of this department of religious culture. The Church reports 19,287 schools, being an increase during the year 1875 of 329, that being over six and a third for each Sabbath of the year. Officers and teachers, 207,182, an increase of 3,773. Sunday-school scholars, 1,406,168, an increase of 22,941. Total officers, teachers, and scholars, 1,613,350, an increase of 26,714. These schools contributed for their own expenses, $659,670, and to the Missionary Society, $176,957. The total increase for ten years has been: Schools, 5,805; officers and teachers, 54,934; scholars, 523,527; teachers and scholars, 578,461. Thus we may see, in some degree, to what great magnitude this agency of the Church has grown. And there were never employed in this department of Christian effort more competent laborers than now; and the facilities for efficient work are, perhaps, numerous enough. And perhaps our anxiety for success has

induced us to multiply too greatly the various helps for this work; at least, there is an apparent danger of Sunday-school workers following these too closely, as the minister may follow his sketch-book. There is no doubt that we are practicing inconsistencies in the Sunday-school such as would not be tolerated in the day-school. Is not the old idea of "six in a class" effete? Why not have the school divided into three or four departments? Why not make the Quarterly Conference a kind of school board, which, upon nomination by the pastor, shall elect both teachers and officers? Would not this place the Sunday-school in the Church and the Church in the Sunday-school? Do we not, as a rule, need fewer teachers and better ones? Will not this method secure them, and also remedy the evil of absent teachers? We certainly need now, perhaps as never before, correct and thorough instruction in our Sunday-schools, such as will make this agency of propagandism mighty in its efficiency.

Educational Forces.

Susannah Wesley was, to a great extent, the educator of her children. She spent six hours each day with her children in school instruction; and such was her systematic endeavor that at the early age of ten her son John was ready to go from home, and enter the Charter House School at London. This date is according to Tyerman, but Stevens

says that he left at thirteen. He was elected to Oxford College when he was sixteen, and when he left the Charter House School "he had, by his energy of character, his unconquerable patience, his assiduity, and his progress in learning, acquired a high position among his fellows." When twenty-two he was ordained deacon. At the age of twenty-three he was elected one of the fellows of Lincoln College. When twenty-four Oxford gave him the degree of Master of Arts. "Wesley laid down a plan of study, and closely followed it. Mondays and Tuesdays he devoted to the Greek and Roman classics, historians and poets; Wednesdays to logic and ethics; Thursdays to Hebrew and Arabic; Fridays to metaphysics and natural philosophy; Saturdays to oratory and poetry, chiefly composing; and Sundays, to divinity. In intermediate hours he perfected himself in the French language, which he had begun to learn two or three years before; sometimes amused himself with experiments in optics; and in mathematics studied Euclid, Keil, and Sir Isaac Newton."

This was the man whom a celebrity of that day said "would one day be a standard-bearer of the Cross, either in his own country or beyond the seas." This was one of the sons of whom his father wrote: "I have the highest reason to bless God that he has given me two sons together at Oxford, to whom he has granted grace and courage to turn the war

against the world and the devil."—*Tyerman.* The same writer says that so familiar were these brethren with the classics that, "in 1731, (John's twenty-eighth year,) they began the practice of conversing with each other, when by themselves, in Latin, and this they continued to the end of life." He also says, "In general scholarship and knowledge John Wesley had few superiors; while such was his acquaintance with the New Testament that, when at a loss to repeat a text in the words of the authorized translation, he was never at a loss to quote it in the original Greek." Southey says: "I consider Wesley as the most influential mind of the last century, the man who will have produced the greatest effects centuries, or perhaps millenniums hence, if the present race of men should continue so long."

Now, our point requires us to consider the influence of that great, cultured mind, as we briefly rehearse the Methodistic history of the world in relation to education for about one century and three quarters. And we shall see that that influence was soon felt, and has been continuously felt to this day in no small degree. How could a Church with such a highly cultured founder be any thing else than deeply interested in education?

In 1739 Whitefield preached his first out-door sermon to the colliers of Kingswood. It is said of these inhabitants that they were so ignorant of sacred things as to be but little above the beasts of

the field; that they were so ignorant as to be utterly without the desire of instruction, as well as being without the means of it. This excited the sympathy of Whitefield, the co-laborer of Wesley. By preaching and conversation he awakened a desire for knowledge. He at once commenced a subscription for a school building, and in six weeks from that time he knelt upon the foundation-stone, and offered prayer that the gates of hell might not prevail against it, and all the people said, Amen.

In a few months Whitefield embarked for Georgia, and left Wesley to complete the building, which was done, and opened for scholars the following year. In 1748 this school was enlarged, both as to building and design. Wesley's fullest biographer says of this school, that it was "the place of not a few remarkable revivals of religion—an academic grove whose scenery was at first beautiful and inviting, and from which have issued many of the most distinguished ministers that Methodism has ever had, and not a few highly accomplished scholars, whose names stand honorably associated with the legal and other high professions, and with England's chief seats of learning." This was Methodism's first school of learning. It soon became so enlarged in all its appointments as to become a suitable school for the sons of Methodist preachers. Its curriculum embraced "reading, writing, arithmetic, English, French, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, his-

tory, geography, chronology, rhetoric, logic, ethics, geometry, algebra, physics, and music." It thus embraced preparatory, collegiate, and theological departments. And for instructors there were employed men of the first scholarship.

Wesley proposed most of the books used in the course of study. And as to how he valued the institution we may learn from what he wrote when in his fiftieth year: "I have spent more money and time and care on this than almost any other design I ever had, and still it exercises all the patience I have. But it is worth all the labor." As to its comparative worth or efficiency he wrote in his seventy-eighth year, "As to the knowledge of the tongues, and of arts and sciences, with whatever is termed academical learning, if those who have a tolerable capacity for them do not advance more at Kingswood in three years than the generality of students at Oxford and Cambridge do in seven I will bear the blame forever." And, remembering that Wesley was a graduate of Oxford, and that it was one of the old and established institutions of England, this is certainly no ordinary praise of Kingswood. And with all the advances and reverses of this institution, more or less common to all, yet, besides its home patronage, it had students from Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the West Indies. But we pass on to say that Wesley soon projected similar schools—one near Leeds, Newcastle, London, and

the Old Foundry. As early as his first and second conferences he proposed a theological school or seminary for laborers, but the proposition failed for the lack of funds; but British Methodism never fully lost the idea, until it resulted in the establishment of its two effective theological seminaries—one at Richmond and the other at Didsbury. To this we may add the colleges at Sheffield and Taunton, the Normal Institute at Westminster, besides many other schools of a minor grade, but scarcely of minor importance.

Now, with all this as prevenient, certainly American Methodists could not be indifferent to education. We have already spoken of their fidelity in instructing the young in the Sunday-schools and at private houses; but let us now speak of organized educational efforts. In the same year that the Church was founded, (1784,) a college was projected by its leading ministers, Coke and Asbury, and the next year its foundation was laid at Abingdon, twenty-five miles from Baltimore. This was an institution similar in scope and design to Kingswood. It was dedicated by Bishop Asbury in 1787. After eight years it was burned down. Another edifice was secured in Baltimore, and this also was burned.

The project of a college was then, for the time being, abandoned. Asbury appeared to think that the young denomination was not yet ready for a college. He never for a moment thought it was not a part

of the mission of the Church in this Republic to take a share in the subject of education. On the other hand, he formed "a grand scheme for the establishment of academies all over the territory of the denomination." To this work he gave his energies, and sought subscriptions. Under his supervision he saw many arise. It is true that, after a short time, perhaps every one of them was discontinued. This was their history for about thirty years. But it is worthy of remark that the first benevolent impulse of the Church, both in Europe and America—before the missionary or Sunday-school impulse—was the educational impulse. Amid loss and discouragement this impulse still survived. It showed the abiding conviction of the Church to be, early and always, in favor of general education. As early as 1820 the General Conference recommended that seminaries be established within the bounds of all the Annual Conferences. By virtue of this authoritative recommendation, the Church in a short time established a number of colleges and seminaries in various parts of the country, most of which remain to this day. Contrary to the opinion of some, the Church has been especially careful as to the education of its ministry. Wesley admitted none as preachers without having previously examined them as to their "gifts and graces." The Church has always been consistent in exercising the prerogative of training its own ministry. As early as 1816 the

General Conference ordered that a course of study be provided for the candidate, and that satisfactory evidence be given that he had pursued this course, before he could be received into full connection. The Church now has a varied and extensive curriculum of study which it requires four years to complete, and when fairly completed it is supposed by many to be of equal value to a course at a theological seminary. The truth is, this is the lowest degree of qualification that will admit the candidate. For a more finished training the Church has its theological seminaries. But the Church does not admit the curriculum of the seminary as a substitute for its own prescribed course of study; and, evidently, it is not yet ready to require of the candidates in every instance to take a seminary course. Such a requirement may become more general and necessary as culture becomes more general.

And yet, as early as 1839 the Church began, in Boston, the project of founding theological seminaries; and now it has five, and their halls are crowded with students from all parts of the country. These institutions are located at Boston, Massachusetts; at Madison, New Jersey; at Evanston, Illinois; at Frankfurt-au-Main, Germany, and Bareilly, India; and are respectively named Boston University School of Theology, Drew Theological Seminary, Garrett Biblical Institute, Martin Mission Institute, and India Conference Theological Seminary. And

besides these there are many theological classes in a number of the colleges and academies. And there is invested in real estate and endowments in those seminaries not less than $1,500,000. There are in attendance about 350 theological students. There are about 60,000 volumes in their libraries. And all this theological force has been developed within a period of thirty-five years. And besides this, since the organization of the Board of Education, in 1866, a fund of $100,000 has been raised, and is invested at seven per cent., the proceeds of which are to furnish free tuition, furnished rooms, etc., in aiding young men preparing for the ministry. Perhaps no Church can offer better advantages.

But we must now summarize the literary institutions of the Church. Universities and colleges, 27; instructors, 216; students, 5,090; academies and seminaries, including collegiate institutes and female colleges, 69; instructors, 504; students, 14,100. University and college property of all kinds, $2,615,137; endowment, $1,928,123; total, $4,543,260. The property of academies, seminaries, etc., is over $2,000,000; making a total in literary institutions of about $7,000,000. Add to this the amount of $1,600,000, invested in the theological seminaries, and we have a grand total of $8,600,000 invested in institutions of learning.

DIFFUSION OF LITERATURE.

Wesley made good use of the pen and press in spreading religious and secular knowledge. He was almost an incessant writer and publisher. As a slow writer, and with his hands full of other work, it seems incredible that he accomplished so much in one lifetime, especially when we consider that he did it all without a clerk or amanuensis. He was a ceaseless tract writer and distributer. He published not only his own productions, but revised and condensed the valuable works of others, and so cheapened them as to bring them within the reach of the great body of the people. Stevens says that Wesley not only led the way in the writing and circulation of religious tracts, but really formed the first tract society of the Protestant world, seventeen years before the origin of the Religious Tract Society of London, (History of Methodism, ii, 492.) In 1782 Wesley and Coke organized a tract society for the distribution of tracts among the poor. Thus he labored for the elevation of the popular mind. And in order that the mind might be directed in a safe channel, in his General Rules for the government of his Societies he prohibited "the singing those songs or reading those books which do not tend to the knowledge or love of God." He made his circuit-riders his colporteurs, by requiring each one "to take care that every Society be duly supplied with books." For

over fifteen years the two Wesleys seem to have had sole control of all their publishing interests. This became too burdensome for them; hence, in 1753, by power of attorney he invested T. Butts and W. Briggs with "the whole care of printing, publishing, and dispersing the productions," and each Society was a depository, and the stewards of that Society the agents. These men located in London, and thus legally began the vast publishing house of the Wesleyan Methodists.

In 1778 he published the first number of the "Arminian Magazine," which was one of the first four of the kind which sprang up during that revival period. He personally conducted it until his death. And it is said, very properly, that it may be questioned whether any English writer of the last or present century has equaled him in the number of his productions. "It was impossible that the mighty energies of the press could be thus put forth for more than half a century among a population, however depressed, without visible effect. Accordingly, the change—the revolution, it may be called—in the popular intelligence and literature, and in the general intellectual condition of the English race, which began in the last century, and is still rapidly advancing, will be found to be coincident with these extraordinary labors. How far the one is attributable to the other, Methodist writers need not be anxious to determine; but it is due to historical fidelity that

they should point to these facts, and leave the world to judge of their relation as cause and effect."—*Stevens.*

What Methodist literature has done for England it has done for America. Here, as there, the early preachers were colporteurs. At the first Annual Conference, in 1773, it was found that besides circulating many of Wesley's books, Robert Williams, the first missionary or evangelist to America, who had been preaching four years, had also "reprinted many of Wesley's books, and had spread them through the country, to the great advantage of religion. The sermons, which he printed in small pamphlets, had a very good effect, and gave the people great light and understanding." That Conference very wisely ordered that all reprints be by the consent of Wesley and the Conference. The Conference of 1784 required the preachers to spend five hours each day "in reading the most useful books." "Be active in dispersing Mr. Wesley's books. Every assistant may beg money of the rich to buy books for the poor."

Soon we find the desire for knowledge increasing. The Conference of 1787 says: "It has been frequently recommended by the preachers and people that such books as are wanted be printed in this country, and with the advice and consent of the Conference they were urged to publish." Coke said of this session, which was held in New York, that the Conference

had so satisfactorily settled the printing business on a secure and large scale that "the people will thereby be amply supplied with books." About this time Philip Cox was called "the traveling Book Steward," and during the three years he devoted to this work it is said that he circulated many hundreds of books. In 1789 John Dickins was appointed Book Steward, and stationed at Philadelphia. Here commenced the Methodist Book Concern. The first book issued by him was the "Christian Pattern," the book that had been so useful to Wesley and the Wesleyans. Dickins loaned the "Concern" about six hundred dollars with which to begin business. The first Book Committee was appointed in 1790. In 1804 the Book Concern was removed to New York, and when launching out into great prosperity, thirty-two years afterward (1836) it was entirely consumed by fire; the loss was estimated at $250,000. It was speedily rebuilt. A branch publishing house was established in Cincinnati in 1820; and, as we have seen, there are four publishing houses in foreign countries. There are now respectable depositories in Boston, Chicago, Buffalo, San Francisco, Baltimore, and in others of the larger cities of the Union. The present net capital of the Book Concern is about $2,000,000.

The catalogue of the Concern is respectably large, showing a somewhat varied range of solid literature. In the departments of biblical exegesis and religious biography and experience it is particularly valuable.

Its Sunday-school department is also large and good, most of its issues being of an instructive and interesting character. Its periodical literature for the Sunday-school teacher and pupil is probably unequaled: as a consequence, its issues are large. Its "Quarterly Review," designed chiefly for the preachers and more cultivated of its people, ranks deservedly high. We think, however, we discover one lack, that of a popular monthly magazine, and we venture the suggestion of such a publication to its enterprising agents.

CHURCH EXTENSION EFFORTS.

The General Conference of 1864 authorized and directed that a Church Extension Society be organized. It was incorporated by an act of the Pennsylvania Legislature the 13th of March, 1865. In July following, at the meeting of the Board of Bishops, in Erie, Penn., Rev. Samuel Y. Munroe, D.D., was appointed its first Corresponding Secretary.

The new society soon became embarrassed by over-drafts, the Church at large not responding, as had been fondly expected, in time to meet these maturing obligations. The secretary was burdened, and he flew from Conference to Conference, and from Church to Church, in hope of awakening the people to the pressing emergency; and while on one of these errands he fell from the cars and was instantly killed. So strangely and suddenly was he called

from labor to reward. Rev. A. J. Kynett, the present incumbent, was called to fill his place.

There were two general reasons that appeared to suggest the propriety and necessity for the organization of this agency. The one was the too frequent solicitation for help by weak and embarrassed Churches. Could these solicitations be equalized among all the Churches they would not be so objectionable to the richer congregations. The second reason was, the new and developing territory of the South and West. Here the people often had the grace and the material, but not the money, with which to build the church. A comparatively few dollars would often greatly relieve and encourage them, and so a church be built. While the State appropriated money for their school-houses, it very properly appropriated none for their churches—and we hope it never will. Thus, as a rule, the school-house preceded the Church. So the general Church must do here what the State cannot do—help build churches in these needy localities.

Just at this time Providence, by the sudden termination of the unhappy war between the South and the North, threw open a wide door in the South. Dividing lines both in the Church and in the State were washed out by the blood of the rebellion. One could now go North or South without let or hinderance.

The "Board," as it is now called, has two sources

from which to supply these demands: the first is a General Fund, derived from annual collections from all the Churches; the second a Loan Fund, from special donations and bequests. This is a perpetual fund, to be loaned to feeble Churches on time, and then to be returned, either with or without interest, according to the stipulation with the parties. During the past nine years the Board has collected and disbursed $819,529 36, of which $201,900 53 belong to the Loan Fund. Of this Loan Fund $37,034 60 have been returned to the treasury and reloaned to other Churches. The Board has aided 1,446 Churches; more than one fourth of all the increase of Churches during the past nine years have received aid from the society. The total receipts from all sources during the past year were over $134,000, and this during the reign of the financial panic. We believe that there is an incipient power in this agency, which when developed, as it will be, will make it one of the grandest means of propagandism. And, in the language of the secretary: "Our geographical position, natural resources, political institutions, with civil and religious liberty for all, together with the number and variety, as to nationality and religion, of our foreign-born population, preserving, as they do, many ties to the fatherland, unite to make this country a center of interest and influence now altogether beyond any other country in the world; and our growth as a nation, and the

character of our government, if it can be maintained and perpetuated, give ample security for a yearly increase of this interest and influence for at least a century to come."

Help for the Freedmen.

The last agency that has been developed by the Church is the Freedmen's Aid Society. This was organized in 1866, and now has its location in Cincinnati. Its great aim is "the mental and moral elevation of freedmen and others in the South who have special claims upon the Christian people of America." These are the words of the Discipline of the Church defining the object of the organization. The General Conference of 1868 so sanctioned this society as to place it on the list of benevolent collections ordered by the Discipline, and commended it to the liberality of the people. This society invests its funds, 1. In the establishment and support of institutions of learning. More than thirteen such colleges, universities, seminaries, and normal schools have been thus aided, besides many other schools of a minor grade. It is the purpose of the society to establish a seminary in each Annual Conference in the South. 2. It supports, partly or wholly, the teachers; this must be done until these freedmen develop intelligence and money for themselves. 3. It aids young men preparing for the ministry. The Board of Education does this for white

young men at the North, but it cannot answer nearly all the applications it has now. The Church needs an intelligent colored ministry at the South who can preach the doctrines and defend the polity of the Church. 4. It trains the teachers in normal schools. It is necessary, as soon as they are able, that the freedmen be taught by their own people; this will make them self-reliant and independent.

This people have special claims upon the benevolence of the North: 1. Because of their number and nearness to us; four millions of them, more than in any State in the Union. They are in the midst of this Christian nation, and not by their own option. 2. They are without intelligence, capital, or credit. 3. As a race, by their labor they have greatly added to our national wealth, for which they have not received an adequate compensation. 4. When freedom and slavery were in doubtful equipoise, one hundred and seventy-eight thousand nine hundred and seventy-five of them sprang into the Northern lines, and lifted the whole nation, and themselves with it, up into the light of universal liberty. 5. It is not too much to say that they look with special interest to the Methodist Episcopal Church. She did more for their freedom than any other. She is the friend of all the poor. Wesley had been their life-long friend. Asbury and those early itinerants sought them out in their cabins, and gave them the first principles of the Christian religion. And while the great northern

Church has disputed about measures, still its inmost sentiment has been in their favor. In helping them we help ourselves, is a general principle of benevolence that has special application here. And in the language of Bishop Wiley, "We feel assured that no society in our Church has accomplished greater good with an equal amount of funds, and none has, at the present time, more urgent claims upon the liberality and prayers of our people."

These are the general methods of propagandism. They embrace the leading benevolences of the Church. We should remember, however, that it is not certainly true that the Church that gives the most is of necessity the best. Large giving is not surely a sign of well doing. What is needed is consecrated wealth, consecrated energy—consecrated to the best uses.

Farragut is reported as saying that he would prefer going into a battle with a wooden war-vessel than with an iron-clad. If his men were in the iron-clad they would feel comparatively safe, and hence not so full of energy, but if in a wooden vessel they would work for life. He would rather have the metal in the men than on the boat. So of the Church. The danger of the future will be that we may trust in our great material equipments. As it was with our fathers, who had them not, so it is with us who have them—if we succeed it will be

because we have the metal in the men. And much as the Church has done for the diffusion of intelligence and piety among the people during the past century, it is but a jot of what she ought to do with her enlarged resources during the coming century.

CHAPTER XV.

Development and Liberal Tendency—Changes Proposed.

EVERY kind of life must have some mode of existence, and to make man conscious of that life it must be in some way manifested or revealed to him. The burning bush, the pillar of cloud and of fire, and the shekinah, were to the Jew so many grand formal representations of the presence and nature of God. It was the incarnate Jesus who declared the Father, since he was God manifest in the flesh. That the world might clearly know of the existence of the Holy Spirit he was revealed in the semblance of a dove, and appeared again in the form of a cloven tongue of fire. True religion is spiritual life, and the same Providence ordered that it should take upon itself a visible form of existence. Not every conception finds a material manifestation. Comparatively few do. Only great thoughts, like huge mountains, rise up to show themselves to the world. Such thoughts as those of the microscope, the telescope, the steam-engine, and the telegraph, will have an incarnation. Amid the surrounding deadness and formality it was a grand thought of Wesley that true religion was spiritual life; and such a thought must have a visible em-

bodiment. And it did have; and its primal form was that of the Holy Club of Oxford. This organization, when first formed, consisted of four young men: "Mr. John Wesley, fellow of Lincoln College; his brother Charles, student of Christ Church; Mr. Morgan, commoner of Christ Church, the son of an Irish gentleman; and Mr. Kirkham, of Merton College." John Wesley soon drew up rules for the government of their life and conduct. This was, as we shall see, the incipient discipline and constitution of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The first public meetings were those for anxious inquirers, appointed for Thursday evening. Soon after other "Societies" for similar purposes were formed. Next in order of this providential development came the laying of the corner-stone of the first Methodist Church, May 12, 1739, in the city of Bristol, England; and the deed by which this Church property was held, although in Wesley's own name, as were all the chapels until a short time before his death, was the first of the deeds by which the more than fifteen thousand Methodist Episcopal Churches, valued at over $71,353,000, are now held. As Societies and chapels now sprang up rapidly, it became necessary to have more extended and definite rules than those of the club at Oxford. Hence John and Charles Wesley drew up the "General Rules of the United Societies," a document which, with some few modifications, afterward became, and

now is, an important part of the constitutional law of the Methodist Episcopal Church. As the gracious revival extended he felt the need of consultation. Hence he called his first Conference in the old Foundry in the city of London, June 25, 1744. It consisted of six regular preachers, and four lay or local preachers. This first Conference has now been multiplied in the Methodist Episcopal Church alone by eighty-one conferences. And to those ten preachers our own Church can now add a clerical force of twenty-three thousand seven hundred and thirty-seven. The regulations and Minutes of that conference furnished the ground-work for the proceedings of all subsequent Conferences. The General Rules and these Minutes were finally bound together, and called "The Large Minutes," and formed their only regulations for many subsequent years. The early evangelists and members in America ordered their lives by the principles laid down in these Minutes, and the first Annual Conference in America, which convened in Philadelphia July 4, 1773, said, "The doctrine and discipline of the Methodists, as contained in the Minutes," should be their "sole rule of conduct."

And let it be noted that these Minutes remained the guide of the succeeding Conferences, and the rules of the individual Societies until the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America, in 1784. Then, to perfect this organization, Wesley abridged

and amended the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the Church of England, collected a number of inspiring hymns and psalms, abridged a form for "making and ordaining superintendents, elders, and deacons;" also a brief and simple liturgy or Sunday service, which, however, was never generally used in the United States. The first edition of the Discipline proper was published in 1787. This omitted the special minutes of the Conferences. The hymns were soon published in a separate form, and, excepting a few additions made about 1832, and the thorough revision through which it passed in 1848, it has remained to this day one of the best collections of inspiring sacred song. The Minutes of the Conferences were thereafter published in separate form. The Discipline contained, as it does now, the Articles of Religion and the General Rules; and other sections were added, as providential necessity seemed from time to time to suggest. Thus is it seen that the economy of the Methodist Episcopal Church is not the offspring of a few minds, but an expression of the concurrent wisdom and piety of many generations. It is not the accidental product of one day, but the providential development of many years. It is not fossilized; it is progressive. Within certain large but safe limits it is not only elastic, but plastic. Its machinery makes provision for its own adjustment. In 1781 the term of probation for membership was three months. The

General Conference of 1784 made it two months. In 1789 it was extended to six months, the present minimum limit.

The probation for a preacher, preparatory to his being received as a regular traveling minister, was, at first, one year; and in 1781 it was extended to two years, which remained the wording of the rule until 1840, when it was required that he should first travel two *successive* years. Prior to 1780 the quarterly meetings were held on Tuesday, but since that time on Saturday and Sunday. The first General Conference ordained twelve elders, and they were all made presiding elders, although the distinctive name does not appear in the Minutes until 1789. At first there was no limit as to their term of office, but the General Conference of 1792 limited the time in one district to four successive years. The office then appeared to be a necessity of the times, since a large majority of the preachers were young and unordained. Each elder was assigned to a district, and was to hold District Conferences, either with or without the presence of the bishop. But when the ordained elders became more numerous than was needed for the districts, or when there happened to be more than one elder in a district, the necessity arose for making one of them the president or presiding elder of the district. Up to the General Conference of 1792 all of the elders in the Conference had been appointed to districts by the

bishop, the same as the preachers to their charges, except as to time, which in the former case was unlimited. This General Conference, composed of all the preachers in full connection, voluntarily empowered the bishops to select from the number of elders a sufficient number for presiding elders to supply the various districts. This, then, became the constitutional law of the Church, and a vast majority of the ministers in the Church, from its organization generally until now, have not thought it best that the appointing power should be in any wise embarrassed. Attempts have been made to modify and change the system. The first attempt was made by O'Kelly in the General Conference of 1792. But it was rejected by a large majority. His plan proposed, after the appointments were read, to allow any preacher the privilege to object to his appointment, and thus throw open the door for a general disaffection—for who does not see that one or two changes would be the occasion, probably, of a dozen more?

And, besides this, there is generally a mutual understanding between the pastor and his presiding elder—who is his committee-man to assist in making out the appointments—as to where shall be his field of toil. But he does not always go where he would desire to go, or where the people ask for him. Amid such a multitude of wishes this could not be the case. And we say that the council of presiding

elders, the advisory cabinet, with the bishop, form as competent and disinterested a body to make the appointments for preachers and charges as any committee of interested preachers and laymen could be. Such a committee of preachers and laymen must be largely men of local views. Leaving out the matter of self-interest, they may personally know little or nothing of the real wants of charges other than their own and those in their vicinity. At most, one such man could not be expected to comprehend the real and relative demands of forty or fifty or more charges as well as a presiding elder who has traveled through them all four or more times during the year, mingling freely with pastor and people. That this power is susceptible of abuse we doubt not. What power is not thus susceptible? But that there is a rational motive prompting this abuse no one can show. The motives are all on the opposite side. They are dependent upon the suffrages of the preachers if they ever reach an elevated position. Will they vote for a man who has intentionally abused them? Never. And more: their very support is dependent upon the good wishes of pastor and people. Thus every motive, selfish and otherwise, is prompting them to inflict no injury, but to do the very best possible for pastor and congregation. The same remarks are true of the bishop, whose official position gives authority to the appointments thus made by the advice of his council.

He is not a local man. He belongs to no section. He, then, it is presumed, would be less warped by partisan feeling. But should he intentionally injure the feeblest of his pastors he renders himself liable to impeachment, suspension, or expulsion. Was ever such power so entirely in the hands of those who bestowed it as this? In one instance, at least, the General Conference has exercised this power, and has suspended a bishop from the exercise of his office. We refer now to the case of Bishop Andrew. It may be the impression on the minds of some that the General Conference did not do so. What is history? That General Conference of 1844 passed the following resolution, which was the final action in his case: "*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this General Conference that he [Bishop Andrew] desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment [slaveholding] remains." How did the South view this action? They say in the Declaration then presented to the Conference that this action resulted "in the virtual suspension of him from the office of superintendent."—*Gen. Conf. Journal*, 1844. The simple question now is, not how the South after the division of the Church viewed this action, or how they regarded Bishop Andrew, but what did that General Conference do? It suspended Bishop Andrew.

A disposition to change another phase of the government was manifest in the General Conference

of 1800. It was proposed that the Conferences elect three ministers to assist the bishop in making out the appointments. This was voted down by a very decided majority. The preachers did not desire the change. In 1808 a plan was proposed to so alter the Discipline as to allow the Conferences to elect the presiding elders. But the plan had not the favor of a majority of the General Conference. The same plan was proposed in the General Conferences of 1812, 1816, and 1820, and each time a majority of the preachers said, We do not desire it, but in 1820 it was rejected by only three of a majority. The subject had evidently gained favor. The minority was so large as that it must be respected. A committee on conciliatory measures was appointed, which reported a plan in which the bishop was to nominate three times the number of presiding elders desired, out of which the Conference was to elect the required number. This plan was adopted. Bishops M'Kendree and Soule announced it as their decision that the plan was unconstitutional. The latter tendered his resignation, which was accepted. It was finally agreed to suspend the new rule until the next General Conference; that Conference suspended it four years more, when, in 1828, it was rescinded. By a large number it was not considered that the plan of allowing the Annual Conferences to elect the presiding elders was unconstitutional. It is not now thought so by a large

number. The Restrictive Rules were adopted by the General Conference of 1808, and all things touching the question were then as now. And what is there in them forbidding the election of the presiding elders by the Conferences? Nothing, if they have the required majorities. And if there were any thing they make provision for the amendment of every one except the first, and it does not refer to the government of the Church. The first General Conference of preachers, in 1784, made it a part of the duty of the bishop to fix the appointments of the preachers; that Conference ordained twelve elders, and the bishops placed them in charge of certain districts; and when the elders became more numerous than were needed for the districts, the General Conference of 1792 gave the bishop the prerogative of choosing the required number of presiding elders and stationing them. Now, these powers the General Conference has bestowed; and cannot the same body, with the concurrence of the Annual Conferences, recall them? But as the presiding elder is a regular minister—not in a higher order, but in a higher office, than that of an elder—it seems proper that he should receive his appointment to his field of labor from the same source as that of any other elder or deacon. But why should he be appointed to the office? There are not, then, constitutional hinderances, as we think, to this proposed change. It may be adopted by any General Conference, the

Annual Conferences concurring, whose wisdom may suggest it as a useful measure. That there has been special abuse of this power, or any serious injury resulting from its exercise, we do not believe. But such a change, it is thought, would harmonize with other parts of our system, and with the principle of liberty. The ministers and laymen choose the bishop whom they wish to preside over the Annual Conferences and fix the appointments. Should they not also choose their presiding elders, the sub-bishops, whom they wish to preside in their Quarterly Conferences and assist in making their appointments? The presiding eldership is an important element of usefulness in the Church. On the frontier work it is now, as it always has been, an admitted element of power. In large cities, and wherever the work is perfectly organized and largely developed, some have thought it unnecessary; but even there the abolition of the system is not so much what is wanted as a modification of it. Let the districts there be made larger, in the number of charges in them, and let the elder's presence be most where it is most needed. If, for no other reason, the presiding eldership is a necessity for a correct knowledge of the wants of the charges, that he may wisely aid the bishop in distributing the ministerial toilers. Shall we take away this part of our system, and, having nothing in its stead, allow laymen and pastors to present their individual, and often antago-

nistic, claims directly to the bishop? What confusion this would breed! Shall we allow the laymen and pastors of the Annual Conferences to elect their presiding elders, to form an advisory council in which both their interests would be represented?

As the matter now stands before the Church, there is a pressing demand for some modification. Some are asking that the law of the Church make them what they are now in practice, a co-ordinate power to the episcopacy, particularly in making the appointments. Some are asking that they be elected by the Annual Conference by ballot and without debate. Others ask that the bishop nominate a certain number, from which the Conference may elect. Others, still, wish that they may be constituted as chairmen of certain districts, and have regular charges or appointments. What the outcome will be no one can tell; but, as we have seen, the index of history points certainly to a more liberal and republican policy in the form of Church government. We have not designed to here indicate our views upon this part of the government; this we have done in another place. We here simply record the efforts that have been made, and are being made, as it is supposed, to modify and liberalize this feature of our church government.

With respect to the episcopacy there have been many changes and modifications in the history of the Church, and the tendency of these changes has

mostly been toward a greater liberality and freedom, in harmony with the whole system. In the development of its governmental system the whole sweep of its progress has been, and is now, clearly and grandly in this direction. The power and authority of Wesley in and over the Conferences and the Church, as we have elsewhere shown, was almost without limit; and under the circumstances no one will say that the exercise of such power was contrary to our Christian system or unscriptural. At least no affectionate child of Wesley can say so much. A prodigal may.

In the first Annual Conferences, from 1773 to 1784, the general assistant of Mr. Wesley presided and made the appointments, not by the choice or authority of the Conferences, but by the authority of Wesley. The first who thus acted was Thomas Rankin; the second was Francis Asbury. William Watters, in the absence of both the others, was elected president of one Conference, just as we are now authorized by the Discipline to elect, in the absence of a bishop, a president of the Conference, who is under all the limitations and restrictions of a bishop acting in that Conference. He can make the appointments, but cannot ordain. Wesley was amenable to no one, and his general assistant was amenable to no Conference, only to Wesley himself. But no sooner was the Church in the United States organized, than this part of the sys-

tem was radically changed. Every member of the Church, from the highest to the lowest, must be made responsible to some other part of the Church for his moral and official conduct. The first General Conference took control of the bishop and his office. And, first, they chose the man whom they desired; then they laid down the rules governing his conduct, ("Hist. Disc.," p. 123,) and then limited his powers, and provided for his trial and expulsion. They made him finally amenable to the body that gave him the office.

But to show that our governmental system is tending toward a more liberal policy, let us note these facts. The first General Conference gave the bishops the power "to receive appeals from the preachers and people, and decide them." In 1787 that power was withdrawn, and ever since, with little variation, our preachers and people have always been granted the privilege of trial and appeal, and that in the presence of their peers. The General Conference of 1792 provided, as had not been provided before, for the preliminary trial and suspension of a bishop in the interim of General Conferences. Thus any bishop who departs from the duties laid down by the General Conference can be suspended at any time.

The last General Conference (1872) provided for a Judicial Conference to constitute a Court of Triers of Appeals. It is an Appellate Court for the trial

of bishops and ministers. Each Annual Conference is to elect seven elders, to constitute a part of this court. In case of an appeal by a minister from an Annual Conference, "with due regard to the wishes and rights of the appellant," the elders so elected of the three conveniently near Conferences shall assemble as this court, with one of the bishops as president. The appellant here, as elsewhere, has "the right of peremptory challenge." He may challenge so far as to exclude eight, more than one third of the court, but he cannot reduce the original number, twenty-one, below thirteen, which is necessary as a quorum. And the General Conference shall carefully review the decisions of law questions contained in the records and documents transmitted to that body, and "in case of serious error therein shall take such action as justice may require." Here is certainly a grand advance step. By this plan the guilty will not only be more certainly detected, but his proper punishment meted out the sooner. By it, also, the innocent is more speedily exculpated from all censure. How carefully does the entire mode of trial in the Methodist Episcopal Church guard the rights of the individual on the one hand, and the purity of the Church on the other!

The last General Conference also provided for more exact justice concerning the trial of a bishop. For immoral conduct he is to appear before the

Court of Triers of five neighboring Conferences. The same rights belong to him as to the ministers. A bishop presides. The accused may challenge of the original number, thirty-five, fourteen, but no more, so as not to reduce the court below twenty-one. And this court has "full power to try the accused bishop, and to suspend him from the functions of his office, or expel him from the Church, as they may deem his offense requires." The decision of this court, as constituted in the case of a minister, except the review of the decisions upon points of law by the General Conference, is final. This was his appellate court, composed of his peers, and in every respect competent. But heretofore, by the law of the Church, the bishop had no appeal whatever. By this provision the bishop has an appeal to the General Conference, which has final jurisdiction in the case. Thus we see that the Church has complete control not only of the office, but of the officer. Here, also, the full rights of the incumbent are securely protected by the ægis of legislative enactment.

The same General Conference popularized another measure concerning this office—that of the bishops' support. The bishops are now to be supported in part, like the other ministers of the Church, by voluntary contributions directly from the people. And it was found that the laymen of the Church were almost unanimously in favor of this measure.

This shows how much the laity are attached to the episcopacy. This proves, also, that they do not think the support of the bishops financially burdensome, or a useless expenditure of money. They ask for and get the privilege of contributing directly for their support, and, doubtless, the bishops will soon be thrown on the people for their entire support. Liberal changes have also been made respecting the general superintendency of the Church, and doubtless more will be made as the wisdom of the Church shall think needful. That our episcopacy should become properly diocesan we do not think would be for the good of the whole Church. That it would be less expensive to the Church is probably true, but that it would tend to localize feelings and preferences, and thus, to some extent, interrupt the general harmony, seems quite evident. But something like diocesan episcopacy we have already, and doubtless more of it will be thought necessary. We have had a resident bishop in Africa, and will soon need one in India, China, and perhaps also in Bulgaria and Germany, if they remain connected with us. In the death of Bishop Kingsley this necessity is more keenly felt than ever before. Few men have the bodily endurance sufficient to accomplish what he failed to accomplish. Such sacrifices appear too great for the Church, if it is possible to avoid them. That the third Restrictive Rule may be so changed as to allow

this kind of episcopacy is quite evident. And however it might apply to foreign fields, whether it would be best for our home work is an open question. The time may come when it will be thought best to make the bishops diocesan for a term of years. This would be better, undoubtedly, than to make them diocesan for life. Whether or not the bishops should be elected for a term of years, is a question upon which the Church is entering more fully than ever before. That there are some valid reasons for the life-tenure of the office cannot be doubted, and that this has its similitude in the office of supreme judge of the United States is worthy of note; and if the one is not inimical to the republican principles of our Government, the other need not be. But it is thought both of these will undergo a change in time, as rotation in office seems to be a fixed and fundamental principle in the American mind. This is the tendency of thought in the Methodist Episcopal Church. And the bishops themselves, instead of having any desire to tyrannize over the Church, are leading the Church to broader and purer principles of Christian brotherhood and ecclesiastical freedom.

This was beautifully manifested during the discussion of the lay delegation question. While they all concurred in the movement, some of them broke away from their usual custom of silence upon controverted matters, and earnestly espoused the cause.

And no persons in the Church more heartily approved of the final adoption of this measure than did these superior officers.

The subject of the official and legal introduction of laymen into the Annual Conferences is now being brought forward. Laymen have been for years present at the Annual Conferences by the appointment of the district stewards to take part in the assessment and disbursement of most of its financial matters, but have not been in law recognized members of the Conference. Perhaps these, and a few others, may be so recognized by the General Conference action before long. And we presume there will be but little opposition to this measure from any source, for the argument will likely prevail that what we have already in fact we might as well have in law.

It is true, the Church has not always adopted every change that has been even sincerely proposed. To do this would subject it to the evils of special legislation. To preserve its unity it wisely makes laws not for any class, or section, or locality, but for the whole Church. And believing, as Pressensé says, that within certain limits Church government is as supple as it is simple, it will ever be ready to amend as the wisdom and piety of the Church may suggest.

We have been thus careful to note the liberal tendency of the Church's history for two reasons:

first, to show that we never have been, and are not now, tending to prelacy. The whole grand march of our history has been constantly in the opposite direction. Wherefore, then, the occasional cry, in and out of the Church, that we are tending to Romè? Secondly, to show how far we have gone away from original Methodism toward absolute democracy and independency. And, having gone so far, do these things suggest that we continue to go on? Is it not a proper inquiry for us now, whether we have not got far enough away from the justifiable autocracy of Wesley and Asbury? Or is there no stopping-place this side of absolute democracy, the weakest and least secure form of government known? What Methodist would wish to exchange the history of Methodism for that of Independency or Presbyterianism, illustrious as they are? We believe that no part of our government has had as much to do in securing the grand success of the past century as our moderate, unifying, executive episcopacy. Let us keep it.

CHAPTER XVI.

Providential Favor Attending the Church.

ASIDE from the missionary labors of John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, Methodism was introduced into America in 1766 by a colony from Limerick, Ireland. It did not here find every thing ready for its reception. Very far from it. Persecuted, and its name cast out as evil in Great Britain, what else could it expect in this province of King George III.? Then the Church of England had been established by law in the United States one hundred and fifty-nine years. She had here about two hundred and fifty ministers and three hundred Churches. Thus the Episcopalians had this great advantage as to time from the planting of the Episcopalian colony by Captain John Smith at Jamestown, Va., in 1607.

Congregationalism had its origin in the United States by the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620. She was thus in the field one hundred and forty-six years before Methodism. And when the humble Methodists began their toil the Congregationalists had already about five hundred pastors and six hundred Churches.

Soon after the landing of Hudson, in 1609, a com-

pany of Dutch landed on Manhattan Island. This is thought to be the origin of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in the United States. But the records of that Church date no further back than 1662; it is, however, evident that this Church existed here at least one hundred and forty-four years before Methodism. And at that time she had about one hundred and thirty ministers, and as many congregations.

Presbyterianism was planted in America by the importation of some slaves from Scotland during that dark period of Scotland's history, from 1660 to 1685. About the year 1700 Churches were formed in and around the city of Philadelphia. Rev. Francis M'Kenzie was the first regular Presbyterian minister in the United States. The first presbytery was formed in Philadelphia in 1700. And when Methodism appeared she had about one hundred ministers and three hundred Churches.

The first settlement of Lutherans in this country was made in New York by Hollanders soon after the establishment of the Dutch West India Company. In 1669 Rev. Jacob Fabricus arrived from Germany. The eminent apostle of Lutheranism, Henry M. Muhlenberg, arrived in 1742. The first synod was held in 1748. Finally, in 1766, the epoch of American Methodism, she had twenty-five ministers and sixty Churches.

The Roman Church dates its origin in the United States from the landing of Spaniards in Florida,

under the leadership of Melendez, September 7, 1565. Their next settlement was made in 1634 by Lord Baltimore, in Maryland. Soon their priests penetrated far into the interior, and many of the towns and cities of the upper Mississippi and the Lakes, such as Joliet and Marquette, are abiding memorials of their self-sacrificing toil. At the rise of Methodism, in 1766, there were in this country between twenty-five and thirty thousand Roman Catholics.

The true origin of the Baptist Church in the United States was at Dover, New Hampshire, in 1635. There a Baptist preacher from England, Hansard Knollys, began to preach to a congregation; but in 1639 he resigned and returned to England. In this year, at Providence, Rhode Island, Roger Williams and Ezekiel Holliman, having immersed each other, and then ten others, formed themselves into a Baptist Church. This is commonly acknowledged to be the origin of the Baptist Church in the United States. Now, we have before us no exact statistics of the number of Baptists in this country in 1766. But in 1790, twenty-four years afterward, this Church had a membership of seventy thousand and seventeen. In the South alone in 1776 it had one hundred societies. It is, then, probable that at the origin of Methodism, in 1766, the Baptists had ten thousand members and fifty ministers.

The Society of Friends originated in New York, in 1656, under the ministry of Robert Hodgson, a Quaker preacher from England. In 1670 a yearly meeting was held on Long Island. Their first meeting-house in this land was built in New York in 1690. In 1682 William Penn and his colony landed in Philadelphia. How many the Friends numbered at the introduction of Methodism we have now no means of knowing, but simply that their societies existed here one hundred years before.

We have in the history of this nation traces of Spanish and Portuguese Jews as early as 1660. They were among the early settlers of Manhattan Island. Their first synagogue was built in 1706, in the city of New York. Thus this Church existed here sixty years before Methodism.

The Moravians were here as early as 1632, and their Church was organized in the city of New York in 1748.

But the political condition of the country was also unfavorable for the planting, training, and growth of Methodism. The first evangelists, missionaries, and preachers were foreigners, as must of necessity be the case in all foreign religious propagandism; and this fact of itself was sufficient to lay them open to suspicion and persecution. The first preachers were mostly from England. When Philip Embury landed, in 1760, six years before the recognized epoch of Methodism, the elements of strife

were already visible; the contest was preparing, the cloud was lowering, the war was brewing. In that very year the Lords of Trade advised the taxing of the colonies. The next year James Otis, the morning star of the Revolution, began his appeals in Boston for the rights of the people. Offense followed offense, and surge followed surge. Finally, in 1766, the epochal period of Methodism, such was the agitation in the colonies that they compelled the repeal of the memorable Stamp Act. The first annual Conference in America was held in Philadelphia during the stormy year of 1773, in which Parliament passed the famous act respecting tea, which act was followed by pitching a cargo of the tea overboard in Boston harbor. In that first conference all of the preachers save one were foreigners. And during the Revolutionary storm which followed, all of them but one returned to England or located. But this child of Providence was not to be lost in the wilderness; but, protected and nurtured, it grew hardy and strong under these inhospitable circumstances. Because of the demoralizing effect of war upon religion, it would not be strange if the Methodist Church had decreased during the war period. At the first Conference, in 1773, she numbered eleven hundred and sixty members. In 1783, the year of the treaty of peace, she numbered thirteen thousand seven hundred and forty members, being an average yearly increase, for ten

years, of one thousand two hundred and fifty-eight, and this in the midst of the ravages and desolations of a terrible war. And in only two years out of the ten was there the smallest decrease in the reported membership. The first, in 1778, was caused by the return to England of some of the preachers, whose charges were consequently not reported to the Conference: the second, in 1780, was caused by the separation of the brethren in Virginia on the sacrament question. The Conference of that year passed a resolution, saying that they were no longer recognized as Methodists in connection with Mr. Wesley. Hence they were not reported as members of the Church. Thus in these two years to which we have referred there was no real, but only an apparent, decrease in the number of Methodists. At the close of the war the Methodist Church ranked the fifth in numbers, although some other denominations had more than one hundred years the start of her. From the organization of the Church, in 1784, it has progressed steadily and grandly. And if at any time it has in the storm lost a branch, the loss has only caused the remaining ones to have a more vigorous growth.

The Canadian Conference was, in 1828, separated from the Church by mutual consent, yet even that year the Methodist Episcopal Church had a handsome increase of membership. And during the Methodist Protestant secession, between 1828 and

1832, there was a net increase of over one hundred and twenty-nine thousand. The Wesleyans left in 1842, still there was but little decrease during two years. The apparent decrease from 1860 to 1864 was caused mainly, as once before, by the lack of a complete report of the border charges. Thus we see that, even amid the most adverse circumstances, such as the persecution of wealthy and aristocratic Churches, the jeopardy and ravages of war, and occasional factions, the Methodist Church has never truly waned. Had not her system been blessed with more than common resistance and recuperative energy she would have been broken down long ere this. But God has been in the Church and among the people. Hence, not in vain boasting, but in simple truth, we put forth this statement: "It may be questioned," says the "London Quarterly Review," July, 1856, "whether any form of Church government in the world has more of the elements of *power* and *permanence* than this, (the Methodist Episcopal Church,) which expresses Wesley's own idea of a fully organized Church."

But the Divine favor has been manifested in the development of many and great benevolent agencies of the Church. Its Sunday-school work is prominent among the agencies for training the youth of the nation for Christ. Its mission stations dot almost every inhabited part of the globe. While cheerfully contributing its part toward the common schools

of the land, it has also, with the bountiful benefactions of the people, erected and filled with students a large number of academies, colleges, universities, and seminaries for the higher training of the young. With its unequaled denominational publishing house, it sends broadcast a vast, and varied, and virtuous literature, to enlighten and purify the homes of the people.

The spiritual songs of Methodism have revolutionized the psalmody of the last century. Its spontaneous social means of grace have broken up the rigid formality of other days. Its freedom of worship has cracked the shell of old orthodoxy, and brought out woman into a larger sphere, to speak, and pray, and work for the reformation and salvation of the race. Its fervent and fearless preaching has had a force and favor among the people not witnessed since apostolic times. Its revivals have been transfused, like life-throbs, into every religious body. Surely the Lord has been with us!

CHAPTER XVII.

Brief History of Other Methodisms in the United States.

WE think it will be of general interest to present here a brief history of other Methodist Churches, and this must be chiefly of a statistical character. We will first refer to those larger bodies within the United States, the largest of which is the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. This organization was caused by the withdrawal, in 1844, of most of the slave-holding Conferences from the jurisdiction of the Methodist Episcopal Church, because a majority of the General Conference of that year voted not to allow a slave-holding bishop to exercise his episcopal office while a slave-holder. A Southern Convention was soon after called, and convened in Louisville, Kentucky, May, 1845, where the work of organization was completed. They held their first General Conference in Petersburgh, Virginia, 1846. This body has now eight bishops. Its Book Concern is located at Nashville, Tennessee. It publishes eight periodicals, besides numerous Sunday-school helps. Its latest reports are as follows: Traveling preachers, including 261 superannuated, 3,485; local preachers, 5,356; members, including preachers, 712,765; Sunday-schools, 7,204; Sunday-

school teachers, 48,826; Sunday-school scholars, 328,634. Ten years ago (1865) this Church had 2,591 effective preachers, 4,904 local preachers, and 708,949 members. It suffered very greatly, numerically and financially, during the war, and its recuperation is difficult and slow.

Next in order of numerical greatness we mention the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church. It dates its origin about 1818 in the city of New York. It was the indirect result of the Allenite schism in 1816, of which we will soon speak. Allen had ordained a colored local preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and placed him over a congregation in New York. At that time there were about 840 colored members in the various Methodist Churches in the city, and in 1821 only 61 remained. Through the influence of Allen's congregation chiefly they had been led away; and, becoming dissatisfied with Allen's jurisdiction, they withdrew from him, and organized a Church of their own. For several years the Allenite Church was much the larger, but for some reason of late the other has been much the more prosperous. They have 6 bishops, 1,200 traveling preachers, 800 local preachers, and 225,000 members.

The African Methodist Episcopal Church is next in numerical order. It originated in Philadelphia in 1816. Many of the colored Methodists did not feel at home with their white brethren in the same

Church. Hence, withdrawing from the Church, Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, ordained a colored preacher for them, and in 1793 Richard Allen, a wealthy colored member, built a church for them on his own ground, and it was dedicated by Bishop Asbury and named Bethel, as the first church of the former denomination was called Zion. They engaged by charter to remain in connection with the Conference, but strife arose, and they appealed to the Supreme Court, which decided in their favor, and they became independent. They now have 6 bishops, 600 traveling preachers, 1,450 local preachers, and 200,000 members. They have one good periodical and a small Book Concern.

The next in size is the United Brethren Church. This is classed under Methodist bodies, we suppose, because it has Methodist doctrine and usages, and also the itinerancy and bishops. This Church sprang from William Otterbein, a German divine, who came to this country in 1752, and who assisted Dr. Coke at the ordination of Bishop Asbury, in 1784. Its first Conference was held in Baltimore in 1789, five years after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the same city. They have 4 bishops, 48 Annual Conferences, 967 traveling preachers, 1,709 local preachers, and 131,850 members; 1,780 church edifices, and 249 parsonages, and church property valued at $2,502,800. They report also 2,644 Sunday-schools, with 148,694 scholars.

They have a publishing house with capital invested to the amount of $129,826. They publish also three periodicals of respectable character, besides Sunday-school papers.

In numerical order next comes the Evangelical Association. It originated with Jacob Albright, a native of Eastern Pennsylvania, though of German parentage. He was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church; but deploring the low state of religion among the Germans, he felt himself called to work a reform among them. He began these labors in 1790, and although at first having no thought of organizing a Church, yet his labors were so successful that a meeting was called and *the people* elected and ordained him as their pastor. This occurred about 1800. In 1816, after several Annual Conferences had been held, a General Conference was held in Union County, Pennsylvania, where the organization of the Church was completed.

They report 4 bishops; 18 Annual Conferences; 835 traveling preachers; 503 local preachers; 95,258 members; 1,233 churches, valued at $2,935,006; parsonages, 322, valued at $384,049; Sunday-schools, 1,509; teachers, officers, and scholars, 106,965.

Next in numerical strength is the Colored Methodist Episcopal Church of America. This Church was organized under the direction of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, after the war, being formed in December, 1872. It has thus been organ-

ized only about three years. It has 4 bishops, 14 Annual Conferences, 635 traveling preachers, 683 local preachers, and about 80,000 members.

We will here refer to the Methodist Protestant Church, although, perhaps, the "Methodist Church," of which we will shortly speak, is a little larger; but in order to avoid the repetition of some historical facts we will follow the order indicated. Perhaps as early as 1816 the question of lay representation in the General Conference began to be agitated. To give force to this agitation these reformers began in 1820 to publish a paper in Trenton, New Jersey, entitled the "Wesleyan Repository," which was continued until the General Conference of 1824. To further promote their purposes a "Union Society" was organized in Baltimore. In 1824 they began to publish a periodical with the captivating title, "Mutual Rights." Their chief purpose was to secure lay delegations in the General Conference, the law-making body of the Church; all other points, such as the episcopacy and the presiding eldership, their champion, M'Caine, said they regarded as of minor importance. They met in Baltimore in 1827, and organized a new society called "The Associated Methodist Reformers." In another convention in the same city, in 1828, "articles of association" were adopted; but at a convention in the same city, in 1830, by the adoption of a constitution and Discipline the "Methodist Protestant Church" was

organized, and started upon an independent ecclesiastical career.

This new denomination reported at the first 5,000 members and 83 preachers. Almost from the first the question of colored suffrage was a disturbing element. It continued to agitate the Church more or less for twenty-eight years; but the Northern portion not being able to carry their measure, in 1858 nineteen Northern Conferences withdrew from their Southern brethren, and their representatives met in Springfield, Ohio, and organized a Church, retaining the old name and Discipline, except such parts as appeared to them to countenance slavery. Then for nine years there existed a Methodist Protestant Church, North, and a Methodist Protestant Church, South. In 1865, for the purpose of uniting the Northern Church with the American Wesleyan Methodist Church, a preliminary meeting was held in Cleveland, Ohio. Another convention for a similar purpose was held in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1866; the work of organization was completed at its first General Conference in Cleveland, in 1867. As a compromise measure, the name "The Methodist Church" was adopted. It was afterward found that but few of the Wesleyans actually entered into this new combination, the leading ministers preferring to return to the Methodist Episcopal Church. The denomination has a publishing house in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and issues a good religious paper—

"The Methodist Recorder"—of which Rev. Alexander Clark, D.D., is editor. They report 775 itinerant and 507 unstationed preachers, 53,400 members, 1,783 probationers, 667 church edifices, and 171 parsonages, with total value of church property $1,767,140. They also have a college of fair ability at Adrian, Michigan, which is doing a good work in training young men for their ministry.

Between this Church and the Methodist Protestant Church negotiations are pending for union. In October, 1875, the commissioners met in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and agreed on a basis of union to be submitted to the several Annual Conferences of the two Churches, and it is believed that the basis will be accepted and the union finally effected. They both agree to maintain the old name, "The Methodist Protestant Church." This old Church now reports 650 itinerant preachers, 200 local preachers, 49,319 lay members, besides an estimated number of 15,000 failing to report; Sunday-school scholars estimated at 50,000. They publish a good periodical, the "Methodist Protestant," of which Rev. E. J. Drinkhouse is editor. They have a college of moderate parts located at Westminster, Maryland. Because of the devastation during the war, and the process of absorption since the war, this Church has had great difficulty to achieve any success, if, indeed, it has not been engaged in a struggle for mere existence.

The American Wesleyan Methodist Church was organized because it was supposed that the Methodist Episcopal Church was not sufficiently anti-slavery. Rev. Orange Scott, a prominent minister of those times, withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1842, and a number of others followed him as their standard-bearer. In 1843 a convention was held in Utica, New York, and organized the "Wesleyan Methodist Connection." They have a small publishing house at Syracuse, New York, from which is issued the denominational periodical called the "American Wesleyan," and Rev. J. N. Stratton is both book agent and editor. They report 250 itinerant and 190 local preachers, and 20,000 members. The Church is gradually declining.

One of the minor organizations is the Free Methodists. It was, according to the "American Cyclopedia," organized in 1860, and now has 170 preachers and 6,000 members.

The Primitive Methodists of the United States is not an offshoot of the Methodist Episcopal Church. In 1829 four Primitive Methodist preachers came to the United States from England, and began to preach in New York, Philadelphia, Albany, and some other places. They seem not to have been very successful in the East, but more prosperous in the West. In 1842 a small colony of them came from England and settled in Illinois, and are mostly

now found in this State and Wisconsin. They still hold some relation to the Primitive Methodists in England. They now report in all 45 preachers and 2,800 members.

The Congregational or Independent Methodists are such as for any reason have become independent and separate Churches, having no official connection with any other Church organization. Usually in a brief period of time the local congregation becomes extinct, or is absorbed by some other religious body. Of these Methodists there are supposed to be 23 preachers and 9,500 members.

The first six of the above bodies are episcopal in their form of government. Add to their statistics those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which are 10,923 itinerant and 12,881 local preachers, and 1,580,559 members, and we have as a total of Episcopal Methodists in the United States 18,645 itinerant and 23,382 local preachers, and 3,025,427 members. The last six are non-episcopal, and aggregate 1,808 itinerant and 1,002 local preachers, and 147,802 members.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Union of Methodisms.

PROVIDENCE is saying to the camp of Israel to-day, Draw closer together; and it is reasonable to think that the Churches of similar faith and polity would be first and freest to heed this indication of Providence. And, first of all, there must be spiritual union; this will lead to fraternal union, and this to organic union. This is God's order, and none other can succeed.

The Christian forces of the age are centripetal, and no human power can change them. It is the pillar of cloud and of fire of Divine Providence, and he who does not step to the front in the light, with God's marching hosts, will grope his way in darkness, and will finally be overwhelmed in the sea of divine displeasure. Will that period ever come when there will be but one visible Church? when there will be but one faith? We know that we have been accustomed to argue that numerous Churches of different faiths are a blessing to our world. Perhaps this, in the balancing of good and evil, is correct; but is it not accommodating the Churches to a recognized evil? After all, there can be but one true faith; and every departure from it,

however great or small, must be an evil. In other words, is it better that men should disagree than that they should agree? Is confusion better than order? Is division better than unity? Uniformity in every other department of thought is considered of great value. Why should not a unity of faith in religion be considered of equal importance? If it is well that we now agree upon cardinal points, would it not be better still if we also agreed upon all? If division and dissension is an evil in a local society, is it not an evil in the general community? "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no division among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment." 1 Cor. i, 10. "For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" 1 Cor. iii, 3, 4. Evidently Paul did not consider a difference of thought and of judgment a blessing, but a great evil.

But prophecy clearly indicates a time when there shall be unanimity in religious belief. "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion." Isa. lii, 8. "Moreover, thou son of man, take thee one stick,

and write upon it, For Judah, and for the children of Israel his companions: then take another stick, and write upon it, For Joseph, the stick of Ephraim, and for all the house of Israel his companions: and join them one to another into one stick; and they shall become one in thine hand." Ezek. xxxvii, 16, 17. "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd." John x, 16. "Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." John xvii, 20, 21. "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. iv, 4–6. Paul, recognizing the diversity of beliefs that are in the world, speaks of the agencies that are to be employed "till we all come in the unity of the faith." Eph. iv, 13. The very least that can be said of these Scriptures is, that they teach, first, that the diversity of religious belief in the world is not what God desires. And, second, presuming that these prophecies will be fulfilled, they declare that the period will come when there will be one universal faith among Christians, and there will be one

fold and one Shepherd. But will that be in time or in eternity? We believe that it will be in time, but perhaps very near its close.

But if it shall be reserved for eternity, the nearer earth approximates to the character of heaven, surely the better it will be. But whichever it shall be, there is an evident and providential coming together of the religious bodies of the world. Society has reached its maximum limit in its disintegration and division of proper religious belief. Hereafter centralization and unification will go on more or less rapidly, preparatory to the ushering in of millennial glory. Evangelical alliances and Christian conventions are not without important religious significance. Commissions of fraternal greeting and propositions for ecclesiastical union are not simply the accidents of the hour. They are the divine foreshadowings of a glorious consummation. It appears to be the indication of Providence, and it certainly accords with human reason, that those bodies having similar faith should be the first to coalesce. Hence all Presbyterian bodies have the question of union under advisement. In the union of the Old and New School, which was the first great schism in any religious body in the United States, how befitting that they should take the initiatory step. The work of the fusion of the Presbyterian elements, with such a grand beginning, cannot, and should not, stop at this. It must go on.

Union is also the living theme among the different Baptist bodies; and while the last Church to suffer any great dismemberment, she may also be the last in being firmly bound together. But the great work of restoring sundered ties, of healing old breaches, and binding up ugly wounds, has already commenced in the Methodist family. And that man is unworthy the name who would "tear agape that bleeding wound afresh."

There is much to forgive and forget by us all; but to do this is magnanimous and Christ-like. Allowing that we were justified in forming separate bodies, can we now justify ourselves in continuing separate bodies? It is admitted that the main causes or occasions of separation have passed away forever; and if we would not have separated had not those causes or occasions existed, why should we now remain divided when those causes have been destroyed? There can be no good reason assigned, unless new and adequate causes for separation have arisen. These have not existed. They do not now exist. The *chief* cause of the Protestant separation in 1830 was the lack of lay representation in the Church. Had the General Conference in 1828 incorporated it into the system, just as it is now, they most certainly would not have separated.

The "Methodist Recorder," May 25, 1820, said, when Rev. John Scott, D. D., was editor, "Such a

plan would have been accepted by the reformers." That measure is now carried in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and as it is not perfect, it will be modified and changed from time to time, as the wisdom and piety of the Church may think needful.

The work of reunion has begun where disunion left off. "The Methodist" and the Methodist Protestant Churches, by their commissioners, have substantially agreed upon a basis of union. We hope and believe that the basis will be ratified by both bodies.

The first and great cause of the Wesleyan Methodist separation in 1843 was slavery. They believed that the Church was not sufficiently radical upon this great question. And it is to be believed that had the General Conference of 1840 clearly and forever freed the Church from all appearance of compromise with this great evil, whatever else might have been the result, the Wesleyan Methodist Church would never have been organized. This position is indorsed by Matlack, Prindle, and Lee, three eminent ministers of that Church who have recently reunited with the Methodist Episcopal Church. The following quotations are from a letter published: "The providential cause of our denominational existence was removed. The distinctive character which that cause had given the Wesleyans, almost exclusively, for many years, had become the common trait of American Methodism." "We first met with breth-

ren of other branches of Methodism in council at two conventions in view of effecting an organic reunion. But this was found impracticable. Only four (so far as reported at Cleveland) of our ministerial associates ultimately united with those known as the 'Methodist Church.'" Thus under the influences which have not been personal or mercenary, but providential, they, the ministers and people, are returning to meet a cheerful greeting upon the equal and broad platform of American Methodism. "For," say those eminent ministers, "it cannot be possible that mere ecclesiastical formula shall forever keep asunder the communicants of the different branches of Methodism, whose articles of faith, views of personal experience, modes of worship, and endless destiny are positively one and indivisible." This is a noble sentiment. It is not tainted with sectarian bias, but is fragrant with the broadest and purest catholicity. With it what true Methodist would wish to disagree?

In 1844 the Methodist Episcopal Church suffered its greatest dismemberment. It was almost an equal division of the ecclesiastical body. Not simply slavery in the Church, but in the high places of the Church, was the only occasion or cause of this separation. And it appears to us unwise and unprofitable to now discuss whether it was a mutual separation or an unwarranted division of the Church. Divided we *are*, is the fact with which we have to deal. And

we should give ourselves wholly to words and deeds of comity and amity, and mutually hope and pray for a speedy healing of the breach and a restored union.

Under the providence of God, in an hour when we little expected it, slavery perished forever. And let us now, in Church as well as in State, meet together and mutually "bury the hatchet" forever. Let each proclaim for the other universal amnesty. What generous soul wishes to harrow up the partisan feelings of the past? Who wishes to live on hate rather than love? "Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers." 2 Tim. ii, 14. But despite these efforts of the few, the work of reconciliation and reunion will go on. Those who are engaged in blowing up strife will at last "blow out," and the authors of discord will perish with their names.

In coming together we have no confession of faith to alter or to form. We are all agreed upon the standards of doctrine. With few and slight exceptions, our books of Discipline are the same. Our means of grace are the same, in which we sing the same inspiring songs. Why, then, should we not be *one?* In the language of our venerable Bishop Morris, "Why should an honest difference of opinions in regard to points of minor importance operate

to sever hundreds of thousands of brethren and sisters who believe in all the essentials of Methodism, both in doctrine and discipline?" Our Church has been most anxious and forward in sending out commissions and propositions for reunion. And, although larger and more influential than any other, these acts certainly speak well for her generosity. But, having done so, she doubtless has done nothing more than her Christian duty. In view of these facts, why should not the different Methodist bodies unite? We think we should unite because we are descendants of the same spiritual father, Wesley; we are brothers, we are friends. During a certain war between the English and French, in a dark night two war-vessels met in dreadful encounter, supposing themselves enemies. But when the darkness lifted and the morning came, they saw that they were both flying the English flag.

So with the Methodist Churches. Because of the darkness of error we have been antagonists. But, thank God! daylight is rapidly coming on; the mist is lifting, and we shall soon see that we are all friends, and sailing under one flag. We should form one, because in so doing it would take a cudgel out of the hands of our enemies and give us increased power in the world. There is no need of arguing the fact that the Christian Churches have suffered much at the hands of infidelity because of her numerous and needless divisions.

As a general principle, diffusion is weakness, concentration is strength. A thousand barrels of powder scattered, a grain in a place, and fired at intervals, would burn, it is true, but would produce no concussion. But, placed together in an effective position they would lift up a mountain, and cast it into the sea. O what mountains of error are to be removed! The order seems imperative to the Churches—Concentrate your power! Separate the atoms which make the hammer, and each would fall on the stone as powerless as a snow-flake; but welded into *one*, and wielded by the strong arm of the quarryman, it will break the massive rocks asunder. Separate the waters of Niagara into drops, and they would fall as feebly as the dew upon the tender plant; but combine them, and they would quench the belching fires of Vesuvius. And as we are all fighting the same errors, the same enemy, we can surely do it more successfully by combining our strength, concentrating our forces, and walking forward in solid column. An old fable tells us that the majestic form of Truth once walked the earth, but was dismembered, and that the sundered parts are wandering up and down in ceaseless, weary search, each for the others. So shall it be with the divided body of our Lord; for each separate member is still vital with the memory of the old and loving union, and it will never be at rest till it finds all the others. And, thus united, it shall be holy and without blemish; love shall distill

from its lips, and its words shall be like celestial music, and it shall bear upon its placid brow the warrior's wreath, and in its holy hand the victor's palm. Thank God! the key-note of that glorious time has been struck. The ends of the earth have heard it.

"Put golden padlocks on truth's lips,
Be callous as ye will,
Form soul to soul, o'er all the world,
Leaps one electric thrill."

"Thus to the Father prayed the Son,
One may they be as we are one,
That, I in them, and thou in me,
They one with us may ever be.
Children of God, combine your bands!
Brethren in Christ, join hearts and hands,
And pray, for so the Father willed,
That the Son's prayer might be fulfilled."

APPENDIX.

"If all legislators and preachers knew precisely the state of facts in society, they could legislate and preach with vastly more effect."—EDWARD D. MANSFIELD, LL.D.

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS.

1766.—EPOCHAL METHODIST PERIOD.

Statistics: 1 local preacher and 5 members.

In October of this year Philip Embury, a local preacher, organized in the city of New York a Society of five members, the first Methodist organization in America.

1773.—FIRST CONFERENCE PERIOD.

The first Conference of Methodist Preachers in America was held in Philadelphia, July 4, of this year. It was convened by the call of Rev. Thomas Rankin, John Wesley's superintendent, and presided over by himself. The appointments made were as follows:—

New York, Thomas Rankin, to change in four months; Philadelphia, George Shadford, to change in four months; New Jersey, James King, William Watters; Baltimore, Francis Asbury, Robert Strawbridge, Abraham Whitworth, Joseph Yearbry; Norfolk, Richard Wright; Petersburgh, Robert Williams.

Statistics: New York, 180; Philadelphia, 180; Virginia, 100; New Jersey, 200; Maryland, 500. Total preachers, 10; members, 1,160; edifices, 2. Increase in eight years, 9 preachers, 1,155 members, 2 edifices.

1776.—NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE PERIOD.

The fourth Conference was held in Baltimore, May 24, of this year.

Statistics: Preachers, 24; members, 4,921; circuits, 11; edifices, 4. Increase in three years: Preachers, 14; members, 3,766; circuits, 5; edifices, 2.

1783.—NATIONAL PEACE PERIOD.

The Conference this year convened first at Ellis's Chapel, Virginia, May 7; but, for the accommodation of those preachers at a distance, it adjourned to Baltimore, May 27.

Statistics: Preachers, 82; members, 13,740. 1776–1783 may include the War period, yet at its close they had made the following increase: Preachers, 58; members, 8,819; ministry nearly fourfold, and membership nearly trebled!

1784.—ORGANIC CHURCH PERIOD.

Dr. Coke and Asbury called a special Conference to meet this year, December 24, at Baltimore. It was at this Conference, says Asbury, that they "agreed to have superintendents, elders, and deacons." Then was American Methodism organized into "The Methodist Episcopal Church."

Statistics: Bishops, 2; preachers, 84; members, 14,988. Increase in one year: Preachers, 2; members, 1,248.

1787.—NATIONAL CONSTITUTIONAL PERIOD.

This was the year of the formation of the United States Constitution. Thus the nation was formally organized three years after the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

At this period the statistics of the Church were as follows: Preachers, 133; members, 25,842. Increase since 1784, three years: Preachers, 49; members, 10,854.

There were three Conferences held this year, as follows: Salisbury, North Carolina, March 17; Rough Creek, Virginia, April 19; Baltimore, Maryland, May 1.

Two circuits west of the Alleghany Mountains—one in Kentucky, the other, Redstone Circuit, Pennsylvania—were added.

1866.—METHODIST CENTENNIAL PERIOD.

At the above period Methodism had existed in America one hundred years. The Methodist Episcopal Church, however, had only been organized about eighty-two years. During that period the nation had been involved in *eleven* distinct wars, at least two of which were of sufficient magnitude to rock and shock the entire nation. During that period, also, no less than eight different bodies of more or less magnitude had left the parent body.

STATISTICS, 1866.

Bishops	9	Total Baptisms for the year	82,955
Annual Conferences	64	Church edifices	10,462
Itinerant Preachers	7,576	Value of Church edifices	$29,594,004
Local Preachers	8,602	Parsonages	3,314
Total Preachers	16,178	Value of Parsonages	$1,420,958
Members in full Connection	871,113	Value of Churches and Parsonages	$34,014,962
Members on Probation	161,071	Sunday-schools	14,045
Total Lay Members	1,032,184	Sunday-school Officers and Teachers	162,191
Deaths of Members during the year	12,214	Sunday-school Scholars	980,622
Baptisms of Children	35,536	Teachers and Scholars	1,142,813
Baptisms of Adults	47,419		

CONFERENCE COLLECTIONS, 1866.

Missionary Society	$671,090	Tract Society	$23,349
Conference Claimants	107,892	Sunday-School Union	19,850
American Bible Society	107,288	Total to these causes	$930,419

The General Conference of 1864 asked for a Centenary Offering from the people of not less than Two Millions of Dollars. It received about Eight Millions of Dollars!

MISSIONS, 1866.

FOREIGN.	Missionaries.	Members.	DOMESTIC.	Missionaries.	Members.
1. Liberia	22	1,493	1. German	266	22,787
2. S. America	12	125	2. Indian	10	1,026
3. China	39	181	3. Scandinavian	23	2,146
4. Germany	54	4,647	4. Welsh	4	116
5. India	49	239			
6. Bulgaria	3	....	Total	303	26,075
7. Scandinavia	23	792		202	7,478
Total in 1866	202	7,478	Grand total	505	33,553

INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING, 1866.

Theological Institutions	2	Instructors	770
Colleges	23	Students	22,805
Seminaries and Female Colleges	77	Property	$7,898,239
Total	102		

Publishing Interests, 1866.

Book Concern	New York.	Book Concern	Cincinnati.
	Seven Depositories in as many different cities.		
Periodicals, official	16	Bound Volumes of Books	2,548
Periodicals, unofficial	6	Tracts of various sizes	1,037
Total Periodicals	23	Total Books and Tracts	3,585
Capital Stock		$1,213,327	

Increase Compared with Population from 1850 to 1870.

	1850.	1870.	Inc. per cent.
In the New England States: Population	2,728,116	3,487,924	27
Communicants	84,007	111,001	39
Increase greater than that of population			12
Outside of New England: Population	20,452,380	35,050,951	71
Communicants	605,675	1,250,043	106
Increase greater than that of population			34
Greater increase of members in New England			67

Increase in different Sections of the Country from 1864 to 1872.

Conferences in	Increase.	Per cent.
Eastern and Middle States	184,563	40
Mississippi Valley	162,972	44
The Far West	6,692	88
The New South	205,826	1,564
Home German Conferences	12,433	61
Foreign Mission Conferences	5,855	105
Increase for the above sections	578,341	..
Increase in the whole Church	530,121	53

Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1784–1876.

Born.	Names.	Ent'd Ministry: Conference.	Ent'd Ministry: Year.	Ord'd Bish.	Remarks.
Sept. 9, 1747	Thomas Coke.	Brit. Wes.	1778	1784	Died at sea, May 3, 1814, aged 67.
Aug. 20, 1745	F. Asbury....	Brit. Wes.	1766	1784	Died in Va., March 31, 1816, ag. 71.
..... 1735	R. Whatcoat..	Brit. Wes.	1769	1800	Died in Del., July 5, 1806, aged 71.
July 5, 1757	W. M'Kendree	M. E. Ch.	1788	1808	Died in Tenn., March 5, 1835, ag. 78.
..... 1768	E. George	M. E. Ch.	1790	1816	Died in Va., August 23, 1828, ag. 60.
Aug. 2, 1778	R. R. Roberts.	Baltimore	1802	1816	Died in Ind., March 28, 1843, ag. 65.
Aug. 1, 1781	Joshua Soule..	New York	1799	1824	Ent. M. E. Ch., S., '46, d. Mar. 6, '67.
Jan. 7, 1780	E. Hedding...	N. Engl'd	1801	1824	D. in Po'keepsie, Apr. 9, 1852, ag. 72.
..... 1794	J. O Andrew..	S. Carol'a	1813	1832	Bish. M.E.Ch., So., '46, d. Mar. 1, '71.
Apr. 11, 1789	John Emory..	Phila	1810	1832	Died in Md., Dec. 16, 1835, aged 47.
.....	B. Waugh	Baltimore	1809	1836	Died in Md., Feb. 9, 1858, aged 69.
Apr. 28, 1790	T. A. Morris..	Ohio.	1816	1836	D. in Spr'gfield, O., Sep. 2, 1874, a. 80.
May 10, 1797	L. L. Hamline.	Ohio	1833	1844	Resig'd 1852; d. in Iowa, Mar. 22, '65.
Apr. 27, 1807	E. S. Janes ...	Phila	1830	1844	Residence, New York.
..... 1802	Levi Scott....	Phila	1826	1852	Residence, Odessa, Del.
June 10, 1810	M. Simpson...	Pittsburg.	1833	1852	Residence, Philadelphia.
July 30, 1813	O. C. Baker...	N. Hamp.	1839	1852	D. in Conc'd, N.H., Dec. 20, '71, a. 59.
Mar. 20, 1806	E. R. Ames...	Illinois ..	1830	1852	Residence, Baltimore.
Dec. 5, 1809	F. Burns.....	Liberia...	1838	1858	Died in Baltimore, Md., Ap. 18, '68.
Feb. 25, 1812	D. W. Clark.	New York	1843	1864	D. in Cincinnati, May 23, '71, ag. 59.
Octob., 1810	E. Thomson ..	Ohio.....	1833	1864	D. in Wheeling, W. Va., Mar. 22, '70.
Sept. 8, 1812	C. Kingsley...	Erie	1841	1864	Died in Beyrut, Syria, April 6, 1870.
.....	J. W. Roberts.	Liberia...	1838	1866	Died in Monrovia, Africa, Jan. 30, '75.
July 15, 1817	T. Bowman...	Baltimore	1839	1872	Residence, St. Louis.
Nov. 4, 1817	W. L. Harris..	Michigan.	1837	1872	Residence, Chicago.
Feb. 22, 1820	R. S. Foster...	Ohio.....	1837	1872	Residence, Cincinnati.
Mar. —, 1825	I. W. Wiley...	Phila	1851	1872	Residence, Boston.
Sep. 16, 1825	S. M. Merrill..	Ohio.....	1846	1872	Residence, St. Paul.
Aug. 7, 1825	E. G. Andrews.	Oneida...	1848	1872	Residence, Des Moines, Iowa.
Sep. 21, 1821	Gilbert Haven.	N. Eng'd.	1851	1872	Residence, Atlanta, Ga.
April 4, 1811	Jesse T. Peck.	Oneida...	1832	1872	Residence, San Francisco.

1876.—AMERICAN CENTENNIAL PERIOD.

It has been one hundred and ten years since the planting of Methodism in America, and ninety-two years since the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Bishops	12	Total Baptisms for year	124,930
Annual Conferences	81	Church Edifices	15,633
Itinerant Preachers	10,923	Value of Church Edifices	$71,353,234
Local Preachers	12,881	Parsonages	5,017
Total Preachers	23,737	Value of Parsonages	$9,731,628
Members in full Connection	1,384,152	Total Value of Churches and Parsonages	$81,084,862
Members on Probation	196,407	Sunday-Schools	19,287
Total Lay-members	1,580,559	Sunday-School Officers and Teachers	207,182
Deaths of members during the year	19,591	Sunday-School Scholars	1,406,168
Baptisms of Children	58,218	Total Teachers and Scholars	1,613,350
Baptisms of Adults	66,712		

LAY OFFICERS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 1875.

Number of Trustees of Churches	104,913
Number of Stewards of Societies	88,464
Number of Class Leaders	56,432
Number of Sunday-school Superintendents	27,486
Number of S. S. Teachers and Officers other than Superintendents	231,864

BAPTISMS BY THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 1865–1875.

Year.	Infant Baptisms.	Adult Baptisms.	Year.	Infant Baptisms.	Adult Baptisms.
1865	32,891	29,150	1871	54,517	65,750
1866	35,536	47,419	1872	53,459	61,311
1867	42,658	59,083	1873	53,287	56,163
1868	46,207	67,065	1874	58,018	71,918
1869	47,509	61,147	1875	58,218	66,718
1870	50,453	66,481			

PROGRESS DURING THE LAST DECADE.

Year.	Itinerant Preachers.	Increase.	Local Preachers.	Increase.	Lay Members.	Increase.
1865	7,175	....	8,493	....	929,250	.....
1866	7,576	401	8,602	209	1,032,184	102,925
1867	8,004	428	9,469	867	1,146,081	113,987
1868	8,481	477	9,899	430	1,255,115	109,034
1869	8,830	349	10,340	441	1,298,938	43,823
1870	9,193	1,064	10,404	1,064	1,367,134	68,196
1871	9,699	506	11,382	978	1,421,323	54,189
1872	10,242	543	11,964	582	1,458,441	37,118
1873	10,571	329	12,261	297	1,464,027	5,586
1 74	10,845	274	12,706	445	1,563,521	99,494
1875	10,923	78	12,881	300	1,580,559	17,038
Inc. in ten years	3,748	.....	4,388	.....	651,309	.....
Inc. per cent	52	.....	34	.....	70	.....

We have included probationers in the above calculations.

The net gain in the full membership of the Church during 1875 was 39,063; add to this the number lost by death, 19,591, (off-setting the number of deaths of probationers by the losses of full members by other causes than death, we have a total of 58,654 members received into full connection during the year—an average of 1,128 for each Sabbath.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH BY DECADES, FROM 1766 TO 1875.

Year.	Traveling Preachers.	Increase of Preachers.	Members.	Increase of Members.
1766	....	....	....	....
1776	24	24	4,921	4,921
1786	117	93	20,689	15,768
1796	293	176	56,664	35,975
1806	452	159	130,570	73,906
1816	695	243	214,235	83,665
1826	1,406	711	360,800	146,565
1836	2,928	1,522	650,103	289,303
1846	3,582	654	644,229	dec. 5,874
1856	5,877	2,295	870,327	156,098
1866	7,576	1,699	1,032,184	231,875
1875*	10,923	3,347	1,580,559	548,375

* Nine years.

During the decade 1836–1846 the separation of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, took place.

From 1806 to 1816 average per cent. of increase..... 64
From 1816 to 1826 average per cent. of increase..... 68
From 1826 to 1836 average per cent. of increase..... 80
From 1846 to 1856 average per cent. of increase..... 24
From 1856 to 1866 average per cent. of increase..... 27
From 1866 to 1875 average per cent. of increase..... 53

We intentionally omit the decade in which the division of the Church, North and South, occurred as not pertinent to the comparison.

Supposing the actual increase of lay members in 1876 to be the same as in 1875, 17,038, and thus completing the last decade above, the average per cent. of increase will be 55.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL SUNDAY-SCHOOLS, 1875.

Sunday-Schools	19,287
Officers and Teachers	207,182
Number of Scholars	1,406,168
Teachers and Scholars	1,613,350
Schools gave for Missions	$176,957
A decrease of	$10,780
Sunday-School expenses	$659,670
An increase of	$170,250
Increase in number of Schools	329
Increase in Officers and Teachers	3,773
Increase in number of Scholars	22,941
Increase in Teachers and Scholars	26,714
Conversion of Scholars in 1874	87,700
Increase during that year	27,242
Conversions first reported in 1846	2,603
Increase in twenty-eight years	85,097
Aggregate Conversions in twenty-eight years	750,000
Increase in Scholars and Teachers for each Sabbath in 1875	514
Increase in number of Schools	6

COMPARATIVE GROWTH OF SUNDAY-SCHOOLS OF THE M. E. CHURCH FOR TEN YEARS.

Year.	Schools.	Increase.	Officers and Teachers.	Increase.	Scholars.	Increase.
1865	13,948	795	153,699	5,224	931,724	72,024
1866	14,045	96	162,191	8,492	980,622	48,898
1867	15,341	296	174,945	2,754	1,081,891	101,261
1868	15,885	544	181,666	6,721	1,145,167	63,276
1869	16,393	508	184,586	2,930	1,179,984	34,817
1870	16,912	518	189,412	4,816	1,221,393	41,409
1871	17,555	...	193,979	4,567	1,267,742	46,349
1872	17,471	dec. 74	193,691	dec. 288	1,278,559	11,817
1873	18,031	559	197 180	3,489	1,318,603	40,044
1874	18,958	927	203,403	16,229	1,383 227	64,624
1875	19,287	329	207,182	3,774	1,406,168	22,941

SUNDAY-SCHOOL INCREASE DURING THE TEN YEARS.

Total increase in Schools	5,805
Total increase in Officers and Teachers	54,934
Total increase in Scholars	523,527
Total increase in Teachers and Scholars	578,461
Actual increase in Schools	5,010
Average increase for each year	501
Average increase for each Sabbath	9
Actual increase in Officers and Teachers	49,709
Average increase for each year	4,970
Average increase for each Sabbath	95
Actual increase in Scholars	451,503
Average increase for each year	45,150
Average increase for each Sabbath	867

SUNDAY-SCHOOL PUBLICATIONS FOR 1875.

Sunday-School Journal, maximum circulation	114,500
Sunday-School Advocate, semi-monthly, maximum circulation	280,000
" " weekly, " "	77,000
Picture Lesson Paper, maximum circulation	119,000
Normal Class, " "	2,000
Berean Lesson Leaf, total number for 1875	12,392,000
Leaf Clusters " "	9,500
Lesson Compend for 1875	8,000
New volumes added to the Sunday-school Libraries	80
Whole number of bound volumes issued by the Sunday-School Department for 1874	429,932
Berean Question Books for 1874, number of volumes	76,500

BENEVOLENCES OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, 1875.

For Conference Claimants	$152,851 90	Freedmen's Aid Society	$44,198 08
Parent Missionary Society	603,740 59	Board of Education	22,911 61
Woman's For. Miss. Soc.	56,118 97	American Bible Society (estimated)	76,312 00
Board of Church Extension	61,326 93		
Tract Society	16,665 26		
Sunday-School Union	17,585 02	Total	$1,052,710 36

These collections do not include those for the bishops, nor for any local missionary societies. Nor do they include the receipts for legacies, nor personal donations outside the Church collections. Of the above collections for missions the Sunday-schools gave $176,957 27, a decrease of $10,730 24; and the congregations gave $426,783 32, an increase of $2,516 29.

AVERAGE MISSIONARY CONTRIBUTIONS PER MEMBER.

The Missionary Collections were first reported in the General Minutes of 1852. Total raised that year, $152,882. The average amount per member was 2.09. The highest average paid per member by any Conference was in Genesee, where the average was 46.7 cents. The lowest average was in Arkansas, where it was 5 cents. In 1853 the average was 27 cents with California, the highest, (70.6 cents,) and Oregon the lowest, (1.6 cents.) In 1854 it was 29.2 cents with New England, the highest, (57.9 cents.) and Missouri the lowest, (3.9 cents.)

For the successive years the average missionary contributions per member (not including the amount received from legacies) ranges as follows:—

Year.	Per member.	Year.	Per member.	Year.	Per member.
1855	25.5 cents.	1862	25.3 cents.	1869	46. cents.
1856	25.1 "	1863	42.3 "	1870	46.9 "
1857	27.6 "	1864	52.6 "	1871	43.4 "
1858	22.9 "	1865	63.7 "	1872	46. "
1859	25 5 "	1866 (Cent'y year)	65. "	1873	45.9 "
1860	26. "	1867	51. "	1874	39.1 "
1861	22.7 "	1868	47.8 "	1875	38.2 "

In computing the averages in the above table the probationers are included in the number of members, and also the number of members on all our mission fields. If these were excluded, the average would be considerably larger.

Other and Local Collections for 1875.

Salaries of Ministers	$9,890,200
New Churches and Church improvements	2,568,169
Local Church expenses	2,343,450
For Sunday-schools	659,670
Local missions	221,850
Miscellaneous	213,450
Total	$15,896,799
Conference collections	1,052,710
Total benevolences	$16,949,509

Appropriations for Foreign Missions for 1876.

Africa: Liberia	$8,500 00	Sweden; Contingent	$1,500 00
South America	7,500 00	Exchange	4,900 00
Exchange	1,500 00	India: India Conference	63,016 00
China: E. China (Foochow)	13,850 00	Exchange	12,603 20
Exchange	2,770 00	Bombay, Bengal, Madras	500 00
Central China (Kiukiang)	9,430 00	Exchange	100 00
Exchange	1,886 00	Bulgaria	8,000 00
North China (Peking)	478 00	Exchange	1,600 00
Exchange	2,295 60	Italy	17,475 00
Germany and Switzerland	23,000 00	Exchange	3,495 00
Exchange	4,600 00	Mexico	24,000 00
Scandinavia: (Denmark)	8,892 00	Exchange	4,800 00
Exchange	1,778 40	Japan	17,400 00
Norway	12,000 00	Exchange	3,480 00
Exchange	2,400 00		
Sweden	23,000 00	Total for Foreign Missions	$237,749 20

Churches and Parsonages of the M. E. Church, and their Comparative Value for Ten Years.

Year.	Churches.	Inc.	Parsonages.	Inc.	Value of Churches.	Value of Parsonages.
1865	10,041	...	3,143	...	$26,750,502	$4,396,731
1866	10,462	420	3,314	171	29,594,004	4,420,958
1867	11,121	...	3,570	..	35,885,439	5,361,295
1868	11,692	477	3,810	240	41,693,922	6,276,579
1869	12,048	...	3,968	158	47,253,067	6,862 230
1870	13,373	1,325	4,179	211	52,614,591	7,293,513
1871	13,440	67	4,309	130	56,911,900	7,786,804
1872	14,009	569	4,484	75	62,393,237	8,575,877
1873	14,499	490	4,677	193	66,332,580	8,542,554
1874	14,989	460	4,989	311	69,049,523	9,469,170
1875	15,633	634	5,017	28	71,353,234	9,731,628
Increase in ten years	5,592	....	1,874	...	44,603,732	5,424,897
Av. increase each year	559	....	187	...	4,460,373	542,489

This makes about one and four-fifths Churches for each working day each year of the ten.

Methodists in the United States.

Episcopal—	Itinerant Ministers.	Local Preachers.	Lay Members.
Methodist Episcopal	10,923	12,881	1,580,559
Methodist Episcopal, South	3,485	5,356	712,765
Colored Methodist Episcopal	635	633	80,000
African Methodist Episcopal	600	1,450	200,000
African Methodist Episcopal Zion	1,200	800	225,000
Evangelical Association	835	503	95,253
United Brethren	967	1,709	131,850
Total Episcopal Methodists	18,645	23,332	3,025,427

NON-EPISCOPAL—	Itinerant Ministers.	Local Preachers.	Lay Members.
The "Methodist Church"	775	507	55,188
Methodist Protestant	550	200	54,319
American Wesleyan	250	190	20,000
Free Methodists	90	80	6,000
Primitive Methodists	20	25	2,800
Congregational and other Independent Methodists.	23	...	9,500
Total Non-Episcopal Methodists	1,808	1,002	147,802
Total Methodists in United States	20,453	24,384	3,173,229

METHODISM IN ENGLAND.

British Wesleyan Methodists	384,781	British W. Reform Union	8,093
British Primitive Methodists	169,660	Smaller Methodist bodies	325,170
New Connection Methodists	25,837		
United Methodist Free Churches	74,702	Total	709,951
Bible Christians	26,876		

METHODISM IN ENGLAND BY DECADES.

Year.	Members.	Increase.	Year.	Members.	Increase.
1811	145,614	.....	1850	358,277	35,099
1820	191,217	45,603	1860	310,311	*d.* 47,966
1830	248,592	57,375	1870	348,471	38,160
1840	323,178	74,586	1875	384,781	36,310

"This shows, for the first term, (1811–1820,) nine years, a growth of thirty-one per cent each. For the third decade (1830–1840) it was thirty per cent.; 1840–1850 eleven per cent.; and from 1850 to 1860 a loss of thirteen and a half per cent. was suffered. From 1860 to 1870 there was again a growth of about twelve and a half per cent. The last five years show a gain of about ten per cent. Till 1840 the rate of growth was decidedly creditable, all things considered. The cause of the smallness of the increase for the next ten years is beyond our comprehension. Between 1850 and 1860 occurred the terrible "fly-sheet" controversy, which, like the tail of the great dragon of the Apocalypse, swept away very nearly a third part of the whole membership of the English Wesleyan Church. In 1855 the membership, which in 1850 was 358,277, was reduced to 260,858—a loss of almost a hundred thousand. Since 1860 the increase, though not rapid, has been steady; and as the affairs of the connection seem to be in a healthy and vigorous condition, large hopes are, not unreasonably, entertained in respect to the future."

GENERAL SUMMARY OF METHODISTS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD.

	Itinerant Ministers.	Local Preachers.	Lay Members.
Methodists in United States	20,453	24,384	3,173,229
British Wesleyan Methodists	2,589	13,720	467,583
Irish Wesleyan Methodists	185	800	21,273
French Wesleyan Methodists	27	96	2,030
Australian Wesleyan Methodists	362	750	67,912
British Primitive Methodists	1,020	14,838	167,660
Methodist New Connection Church	158	125	25,837
United Methodist Free Churches	354	3,423	74,702
Bible Christian Churches	274	1,747	26,878
British Wesleyan Reform Union	538	104	8,093
Methodist Church of Canada	1,004	1,027	102,887
Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada	247	201	23,012
Other Methodists not included above	380	420	26,000
Grand Total	27,591	61,474	4,189,105

Sunday-Schools in Eighteen States.

At a Sunday-school convention held in Richmond, Va., in 1875, the following interesting statistics of Sunday-schools were presented by Col. Thomas J. Evans, delegate to the International Convention in Baltimore, as compiled from information gained at the convention. Though comprising only eighteen of the States, they present what may be probably taken as a fair average for the country generally. The figures for New York and New Jersey differ somewhat from those given in the abstracts of those States, which were derived from their own Sunday-school conventions; but the difference is not such as to impair confidence in the general correctness of these statistics.

States.	Schools.	Officers and Teachers.	Scholars.	Per cent. of population. Offi., Te., and Sch'rs.	Scholars.
Pennsylvania	7,660	92,424	709,845	27	24
New York	4,370	71,103	517,068	15	13
Ohio	5,545	62,910	314,835	15	12
Illinois	5,976	60,601	425,710	23	20
Iowa	2,649	25,384	354,652	31	25
Massachusetts	1,738	30,011	270,461	21	19
Indiana	3,161	32,643	251,937	17	15
Virginia	2,423	29,075	213,214	20	17
Kentucky	2,376	28,576	209,121	18	16
Missouri	2,834	24,510	181,073	18	16
New Jersey	1,714	27,529	167,805	22	19
Maryland	1,656	18,514	162,589	30	20
Tennessee	2,451	22,055	161,736	15	13
Georgia	2,323	20,907	153,317	15	13
North Carolina	1,985	17,867	131,026	15	13
Mississippi	1,583	14,244	104,452	15	13
Louisiana	1,377	13,220	96,843	15	13
South Carolina	8,412	12,704	93,164	15	13
Total	53,233	604,277	4,518,878	..	..

General Sunday-School Data in the United States.

The following is the Report of the Statistical Secretary at the International Sunday-School Convention, held at Baltimore, Md., May, 1875:—

Number of Sunday-Schools	68,209
Officers and Teachers	740,979
Number of Scholars	5,637,367
Total Sunday-School Membership	6,378,346

GENERAL RELIGIOUS STATISTICS.

First Churches in America.

The first Congregational Church in England, 1602; Holland, 1608: in America, 1620.

The Presbyterians in the United States came from London in 1669, and settled on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. The first Church was organized in Philadelphia, in 1703; first Presbytery, in 1814; first Synod, in 1716.

The Baptists are said to have originated in Germany in 1552: in England, (by separation from Episcopal Establishment.) The first Church in the United States was organized in Providence, R. I., by Roger Williams, in 1639.

The Protestant Episcopal Church began with the early English settlers in several of the American colonies. The first organized connectional Church was organized in Philadelphia in 1785, and two ministers, Rev. William White, D.D., of Philadelphia, and Rev. Samuel Provost, D.D., were chosen bishops.

The first Reformed (Dutch) Church in the United States, in New York, in 1639;

first classis was organized 1757. The first College (Rutgers) established in New Brunswick, N. J., in 1770.

The first Universalist preacher came over in 1770. The first Universalist Church in the United States was opened at Gloucester, Mass., in 1779. The first General Convention was organized in 1785.

The first Methodist Society in America was organized in the city of New York in 1766. It consisted of five members. It was organized by Philip Embury, a local preacher.

The first Lutheran minister in America was Rev. Jacob Fabricus, who arrived from Germany in 1669. The first Church was built in New York in 1671.

The Friends, or Quakers, first existed in England about 1647, and George Fox was the chief founder. Under the leadership of William Penn they founded a colony in the province of Pennsylvania in 1682.

The first Jews existed in the United States about 1660, and the first synagogue was built about 1706.

The Moravians date from 1632.

United Brethren from 1752.

Roman Catholics from 1634; first mass, March 23, 1634.

UNITED STATES DENOMINATIONAL STATISTICS. CENSUS 1870.

DENOMINATIONS.	Organizations, 1870.	Edifices, 1870.	Sittings, 1870.	Property, 1870.	Property, 1850.
Baptists (regular)	14,474	12,857	3,997,116	$39,229,221	$11,020,855
Baptist (other)	1,355	1,105	363,019	2,378,977	153,115
Christian	3,578	2,822	865,602	6,425,137	853,386
Congregational	2,887	2,715	1,117,212	25,069,698	8,001,995
Episcopal (Protestant)	2,835	2,601	991,051	36,514,549	11,375,010
Evangelical Association	815	641	193,796	2,301,651	118,250
Friends	692	662	224,664	3,939,560	1,713,767
Jewish	189	152	73,265	5,155,234	418,600
Lutheran	3,032	2,776	977,332	14,917,747	2,909,711
Methodist	25,278	21,337	6,528,209	69,854,121	14,825,070
Miscellaneous	27	17	6,935	135,650	214,530
Moravian (Unitas Fratrum)	72	67	25,700	709,100	444,167
Mormon	189	171	87,888	656,750	84,780
New Jerusalem (Swedenborgian)	90	61	18,755	869,700	115,100
Presbyterian (regular)	6,262	5,683	2,198,900	47,828,732	14,543,789
Presbyterian (other)	1,562	1,388	499,344	5,436,524	27,550
Reformed Church in America, (late Dutch Reformed)	471	468	227,228	10,259,255	4,116,280
Reformed Church in the United States, (late German Reformed)	1,256	1,145	431,700	5,775,215	993,780
Roman Catholic	4,127	3,806	1,990,514	60,985,566	9,256,758
Second Advent	225	140	34,555	306,240	11,190
Shaker	18	18	8,850	86,900	39,500
Spiritualist	95	22	6,970	100,150	...
Unitarian	331	310	155,471	6,282,675	3,280,822
United Brethren in Christ	1,445	937	265,025	1,819,810	18,600
Universalist	719	602	210,884	5,692,325	1,778,816
Unknown (Local Missions)	26	27	11,925	687,800	98,950
Unknown (Union)	409	552	153,202	965,295	915,020
All Denominations	72,459	63,082	21,665,062	$354,483,581	$87,328,891

UNITED STATES DENOMINATIONAL STATISTICS.

Baptist—(North and South—Year-Book, 1875): Churches, 21,511; ordained ministers, 13,354; total membership, 1,761,710.

Presbyterian (North and South—Minutes of Assemblies, 1875): Ministers, 5,790; total members, 613,368.

Protestant Episcopal—(North and South—P. E. Almanac, 1875): Ministers, 3140; parishes, 2,750; members, 273,092.

Congregational (1874): Ministers, 3,238; members, 323,679; churches, 3,325; scholars, 68,937.

Cumberland Presbyterian (1875): Ministers, 1,173; communicants, 100,000.

Reformed Church (1875): Ministers, 476; members, 101,638; communicants, 88,091; Sunday-schools, 827.

Roman Catholics (Catholic Directory, 1875): Priests, 4,873; churches, chapels, and stations, 6,920; members—not given except by whole population, of which a total of 6,000,000 is claimed without warrant.

The Moravian Church in this country reports (1875): Churches, 75; members, 9,705.

Reformed Presbyterian (1875): Ministers, 100; pastoral charges, 76; communicants, 9,900.

United Presbyterians: Ministers, 591; members, 73,452; scholars, 47,507.

Evangelical Lutherans: Ministers, 711; members, 106,517; churches, 1,182.

Reformed Church (late German): Ministers, 574; congregations, 1,290; members, 128,771.

Free-will Baptists (1874): Churches, 1,875; ministers, 1,141; members, 66,691.

Seventh-day Baptists: Churches, 75; ministers, 82; members, 7,336.

The Disciples (Campbellite Baptists): Churches, about 5,000; members, 500,000.

DENOMINATIONAL CHURCH EDIFICES.

DENOMINATIONS.	1850.	1860.	1870.
Methodist	13,302	19,883	21,937
Baptist	9,563	21,150	18,362
Presbyterian	4,858	6,406	7,071
Catholic	1,122	2,550	3,806
Christian	875	2,068	2,822
Lutheran	1,231	2,128	2,776
Congregational	1,725	2,234	2,715
Episcopal	1,459	2,145	2,601
German Reformed	341	676	1,145
Friends	726	726	662
Universalist	530	664	602
Unitarian	245	264	310
Mormon	16	24	171
Jewish	36	77	152

OUR RELIGIOUS PROGRESS.

The Centennial calls up the facts as to our religious progress. They are very remarkable, and have been collated by Pro^r. Denian, of Brown University. In 1777 the number of churches was less than 950; by the census of 1870 the number was 72,000. Churches have multiplied nearly thirty-seven fold; population eleven fold. In 1870 religious societies owned $354,000,000 worth of property. The most extraordinary increase has been among Methodists and Roman Catholics. The rapid ratio of increase of religious bodies might well seem alarming, were it not that the vast amount of property held by religious organizations is distributed among many bodies. A century ago the Congregationalists were largely in advance; Methodists were hardly known by name. Now Methodists are the largest organization in the land. One hundred years ago the more important religious bodies were reckoned in the following order: Congregationalists, Baptists, Church of England, Presbyterians, Lutherans, German Reformed, Dutch Reformed, and Roman Catholics; in 1870 by Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Christians, Lutherans, Congregationalists, and Protestant Episcopal.

AMERICAN BENEVOLENT CONTRIBUTIONS.

The following are the sums officially reported as contributed by various benevolent institutions during the year 1874–5:—

Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church	$675,080 32
For Conference Claimants by Methodist Episcopal Church	159,876 85
Woman's Foreign Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church	55,406 08
Board of Church Extension of Methodist Episcopal Church	83,327 83
Tract Society of Methodist Episcopal Church	19,840 33
Sunday-School Union of Methodist Episcopal Church	20,196 22
Freedmen's Aid Society of Methodist Episcopal Church	37,028 29
Board of Education of Methodist Episcopal Church	23,744 60
For American Bible Society (estimated) by Methodist Episcopal Church	81,299 00
American Bible Society	577,569 80
" Tract Society (of which for sales, $389,605 08)	502,027 11
" Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions	443,924 00
Presbyterian Board for Foreign Missions	456,718 88
" " " Home Missions	318,613 18
" " Woman's Foreign Missionary Society	69,239 00
American Sunday-School Union (of which for sales, $218,849 66)	322,254 71
" Home Missionary Society	308,396 82
" Baptist Missionary Union	241,970 61
" Baptist Home Missionary Society	199,048 57
" Bible Union	64,217 38
" Church Missionary Society	58,067 03
Evangelical Education Society	30,544 08
United States Military Post Library Association	18,998 65
National Temperance Society (of which for sales, $42,949)	52,268 82
American Seamen's Friend Society	66,759 45
" Female Guardian Society	71,687 04
" Congregational Union	58,180 89
Baptist Women's Missionary Society	30,241 00
Board of Domestic Missions, Reformed Church	46,124 02
" Foreign " " "	54,249 95
American Society for Christianity among Jews	3,006 69
Board of Foreign Missions, Protestant Episcopal Church	116,676 58
" Domestic Missions, Protestant Episcopal Church	154,047 23
" Indian Commission, Protestant Episcopal Church	48,410 37
" Commission of Colored People, Protestant Episcopal Church	14,782 18
Women's Auxiliary, Protestant Episcopal Church	16,000 00
Board of Education, Presbyterian Church	73,679 14
" Sustentation, Presbyterian Church	49,750 53
" Church Erection, Presbyterian Church	116,801 26
" Publication, Presbyterian Church	321,578 00
American Missionary Association	423,842 01
Commission on Freedmen, Presbyterian Church	50,981 75
American and Foreign Christian Union	14,193 97
Ministerial Relief, Presbyterian Church	87,349 19
Board of Freedmen, Presbyterian Church	48,288 96
American Colonization Society	35,922 02

The collections of the Methodist Episcopal Church do not include those for the bishops nor for any local missionary societies. Nor do they include the receipts for legacies, or personal donations outside of the Church collections. Of the Methodist Episcopal Church collections for missions the Sunday-schools gave $186,449 54, and the congregations gave $425,505.

The local benevolent societies raised in 1874 for their chartered home institutions a total of $2,500,000.

AMERICAN MISSIONARY ORGANIZATIONS.

American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions organized in June, 1810. The first mission station established in Bombay, 1814.

American Baptist Missionary Society organized in 1814. Commenced mission work in Rangoon, Burmah.

Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society organized in 1819. First work among the Germans and other European emigrants to this country, and Indians. First Foreign work in Liberia, in 1832.

Protestant Episcopal Board of Missions organized in 1820. First Foreign Mission in Tenos, Greece, in 1830.

American Society for Ameliorating the Condition of the Jews organized in 1820. First mission work proper in 1849.

Freewill Baptist Foreign Missionary Society organized in 1835.

Board of Missions of Presbyterian Church in the United States organized in 1796. First Foreign work in Liberia, Africa, in 1832. First mission in India in 1833.

Seventh-Day Baptist Missionary Society organized in 1842. First work in West Africa. Chinese Mission opened in Shanghai in 1847.

American Indian Mission Association (South-western Baptist—small) organized in 1842. Its work is among the Indians.

Free Baptist Missionary Society (small) organized in 1843. First work in Hayti.

Southern Baptist Convention's Missions instituted in 1845. First mission work in Macao, China.

American Missionary Association organized in Albany, N. Y., in 1846. Its early missions were among the colored people.

American and Foreign Christian Union organized in New York in 1849. Its work has been chiefly in Papal countries. In 1854 it employed 140 missionaries.

Missionary Society of Methodist Episcopal Church, South, organized in 1845.

Reformed (Dutch) Church Missionary Society organized in 1832.

Southern Baptist Board of Missions organized in 1845.

United Presbyterian Church Missions organized in 1859.

The Methodist Episcopal Missionary Society was organized in 1819. Its first Secretary was Rev. Nathan Bangs. The first foreign missionary was sent out in 1832. Liberia was occupied that year by Melville B. Cox as the first Foreign Missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Tabular View of Foreign Missionary Societies.

We have no complete summary of these later than those for 1872:—

BRITISH SOCIETIES.

Missions commenced.	Names.	Ordained Missionaries.	Church Members.	Scholars.	Approximate Annual Income.
1701.	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts.....	464	30,000	....	£97,603
1800.	Church Missionary Society.....	329	21,705	41,941	153,697
1795.	London Missionary Society	230	40,000	38,231	114,306
1792.	Baptist Missionary Society.....	85	37,426	8,032	27,496
1816.	General Baptist Missionary Society.	23	563	1,523	6,000
1769.*	Wesleyan Missionary Society.....	1,071	158,505	264,649	148,585
1803.	Wesleyan Home Missions.....	78	....	....	30,000
1842.	Primitive Methodist Miss. Society.	211	13,893	...	32,280
1860.	United Meth't Free Ch. Miss. Soc..	40	5,656	3,951	11,771
1860.	Meth. New Connection Missions ...	4	284	82	2,500
1840.	Welsh Calvinistic Meth't Missions.	4	211	714	5,500
1845.	London Society for the Jews.....	....	....	....	36,054
1824.	Church of Scotland Missions.....	11	218	2,800	10,000
1843.	Free Church of Scotland Missions..	28	1,906	9,752	27,359
1847.	United Presbyterian Ch. Missions .	40	5,740	6,903	36,671

* The British Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society was commenced in Leeds in 1813, but was not formally organized as a Connectional Society until 1817. Wesleyan Mission work began in Western Africa in 1817; in Southern Africa, 1814; in Australia, 1815; in New Zealand, 1822; in the Friendly Islands, 1826.

Missions commenced.	Names.	Ordained Missionaries.	Church Members.	Scholars.	Approximate Annual Income.
1844.	English Presbyterian Ch. Missions.	12	1,000	800	£7,504
1840.	Irish Presbyterian Church Missions	11	130	1,300	5,000
1845.	British Society for the Jews.....	....	....	....	8,378
1844.	South American Missionary Society	14	....	....	9,352
1855.	Turkish Missions' Aid Society.....	....	....	....	4,500
	CONTINENTAL SOCIETIES.				
1732.	Moravian Missionary Society.....	156	20,742	23,254	24,401
1822.	Paris Evangelical Missionary Soc..	21	1,368	900	8,500
1828.	Rhenish Missionary Society.....	56	4,656	3,752	12,000
1833.	Berlin Missionary Society.....	35	1,351	1,500	10,000
1816.	Basle Evangelical Missions	71	3,478	3,218	33,000
1797.	Netherland Missionary Society....	20	....	13,037	8,000
1852.	Hermansburgh Missionary Society.	44	....	....	7,700
1842.	Norwegian Missionary Society.....	19	114	150	4,000
1860.	Utrecht Missionary Society	10	4	60	4,000
1860.	Danish Missionary Society.....	2	....	....	1,500

RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD.

Buddhists.....	600,000,000	Greek Church	89,000,000
Pagans.....	200,000,000	Protestants.....	76,000,000
Catholics.....	170,000,000	Jews.....	5,000,000
Mohammedans	160,000,000	Total.....	1,300,000,000

PUBLISHING INTERESTS OF THE M. E. CHURCH.

1. Book Concern, 805 Broadway, New York. Founded by Rev. John Dickins, 1789. Agents: Reuben Nelson, D.D., and J. M. Phillips, Esq.

2. Western Book Concern, Cincinnati, Ohio. Founded by Rev. Martin Ruter, 1820. Agents: Luke Hitchcock and J. M. Walden.

General Book Depositories: 1. Boston, Mass., J. P. Magee, Agent; 2. Buffalo, N. Y., H. H. Otis, Agent; 3. Pittsburgh, Pa., Joseph Horner, Agent; 4. Chicago, Ill., B. I. Hitchcock, Agent; 5. San Francisco, Cal., J. B. Hill, Agent; 6. Baltimore, Md., D. H. Carroll, Agent; 7. Philadelphia, Pa., J. B. M'Cullough, Agent; 8. St. Louis, Mo., B. St. James Fry, Agent; 9. Portland, Oregon, W. Roberts, Agent.

Publishing Houses in Foreign Countries: 1. Germany, at Bremen, founded 1850. 2. Sweden, at Gottenburgh, founded 1874. 3. Mexico, at city of Mexico, founded 1875. 4. China, at Foochow, founded 1861. 5. India, at Lucknow, founded 1863.

PERIODICALS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

Christian Advocate, New York, founded 1826. Rev. Daniel Curry, D.D., Editor, Rev. W. H. De Puy, D.D., Assistant Editor. Present circulation, 49,950.

Christian Advocate, Cincinnati, founded 1834. Rev. F. S. Hoyt, D.D., Editor, J. J. Hight, Esq., Assistant Editor. Present circulation, 17,500.

Christian Advocate, Pittsburgh, founded 1833. Rev. W. Hunter, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 13,440.

Christian Advocate, Chicago, founded 1853. Rev. Arthur Edwards, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 13,000.

Christian Apologist, Cincinnati, founded 1839. Rev. William Nast, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 12,000.

Christian Advocate, Syracuse, N. Y., founded 1841. Rev. O. H. Warren, A.M., Editor. Present circulation, 10,000.

Christian Advocate, St. Louis, founded 1857. Rev. B. St. James Fry, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 9,860.

Christian Advocate, San Francisco, founded 1853. Rev. H. C. Benson, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 2,600.

Christian Advocate, Portland, Oregon, founded 1855. Rev. Isaac Dillon, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 1,750.

The Methodist Advocate, Atlanta, Ga., founded 1869. Rev. E. Q. Fuller, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 3,840.

Haus und Herd, German, Cincinnati, founded 1873. Rev. H. Liebhart, D.D., Editor. Present circulation 5,000.

Sandebudet, Swedish, Chicago, founded 1862. Rev. N. O. Westergren, Editor. Present circulation, 2,500.

Quarterly Review, New York, founded 1819. Rev. D. D. Whedon, D.D., LL.D., Editor. Present circulation, 8,000.

Ladies' Repository, Cincinnati, founded 1841. Rev. E. Wentworth, D.D., Editor, S. W. Williams, A.M., Assistant Editor. Present circulation, 15,000.

Golden Hours, Cincinnati, founded 1869. H. V. Osborne, Editor. Present circulation, 5,800.

Normal Class, New York, founded 1875. Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., Editor. Present circulation, 2,500.

Sunday-School Journal, New York, founded 1860. Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., Editor, Rev. J. M. Freeman, D.D., Associate Editor. Present circulation, 115,000.

Sunday-School Advocate, New York, founded 1840. Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., Editor, Rev. J. M. Freeman, D.D., and Mary A. Lathbury, Assistant Editors. Present circulation: semi-monthly, 134,000; weekly, 25,500.

Missionary Advocate, New York, founded 1846. Rev. R. L. Dashiell, D.D., and Rev. J. M. Reid, D.D., Editors. Present circulation, 105,000.

There are several other Methodist journals published by individuals, but not under the direction of the General Conference. The Church also publishes a number of periodicals in different foreign nations.

Sales at the Book Concern.

At the annual meeting of the Book Committee of the Methodist Episcopal Church, the reports of Nelson & Phillips, Book Agents at New York, and Hitchcock & Walden, Book Agents at Cincinnati, furnished the following summaries of sales for the business year ending Nov. 30, 1875:—

New York:	Books	$441,965 75		
	Periodicals	224,184 44	$666,150 19	
Boston			74,430 49	
Buffalo			50,121 13	
Pittsburgh			52,836 60	
San Francisco			25,279 08	
Syracuse—Northern Advocate			25,595 49	
Total at New York Concern and Branches				$894,412 98
Cincinnati:	Books	$182,859 90		
	Periodicals	217,011 64	$399,871 54	
Chicago:	Books	88,016 56		
	Periodicals	96,398 38	184,414 94	
St. Louis:	Books	33,798 71		
	Periodicals	44,282 12	78,080 83	
Atlanta:	Books	4,868 23		
	Periodicals	5,478 12	10,346 35	
Total for Western Book Concern				672,713 66
Total Book Concern sales				$1,567,126 64

EDUCATIONAL.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING IN THE M. E. CHURCH.

THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTIONS.

Name of Institution.	Place.	F'n'd	President.
Boston University	Boston, Mass	1839	W. F. Warren, D.D.,LL.D.
Drew Seminary	Madison, N. J	1867	J. F. Hurst, D.D.
Garrett Institute	Evanston, Ill	1856	H. Bannister, D.D.

IN FOREIGN LANDS.

Martin Institute	Frankfort, Ger	1858	S. Nippert.
Bareilly Theological Seminary	Bareilly, India	1872	T. J. Scott, D.D.
Theological School	East China		

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.

Albion College	Albion, Mich	1841	G. B. Jocelyn, D.D.
Alleghany College	Meadville, Pa	1815	L. H. Bugbee, D.D.
Baker University	Baldwin City, Kan.	1858	S. S. Weatherby, A.M.
Baldwin University	Berea, Ohio	1846	W. D. Goodman, D.D.
Boston University	Boston, Mass	1867	W. F. Warren, D.D.,LL.D.
Cornell College	Mt. Vernon, Iowa	1857	W. F. King, D.D.
Dickinson College	Carlisle, Pa	1783	J. A. M'Cauley, D.D.
East Tenn. Wesleyan University	Athens, Tenn	1867	J. A. Dean, D.D.
German Wallace College	Berea, Ohio	1863	Wm. Nast, D.D.
Hamline University	St. Paul, Minn		
Illinois Wesleyan University	Bloomington, Ill	1850	S. Fallows, D.D.
Indiana Asbury University	Greencastle, Ind	1837	Rev. G. D. Martin.
Iowa Wesleyan University	Mt. Pleasant, Iowa		John Wheeler, D.D.
Lawrence University	Appleton, Wis	1847	Geo. M. Steele, D.D.
M'Kendree College	Lebanon, Ill	1827	R. Allyn, D.D.
Mount Union College	Mt. Union, Ohio	1846	O. N. Hartshorn, D.D.
Northwestern University	Evanston, Ill	1855	C. H. Fowler, A.M., D.D.
Ohio Wesleyan University	Delaware, Ohio	1844	C. H. Payne, D.D.
Pacific Methodist College	Santa Rosa, Cal	1862	A. S. Fitzgerald, D.D.
Simpson Centenary College	Indianola, Iowa	1867	Alex. Burns, D.D.
Syracuse University	Syracuse, N. Y	1870	E. O. Haven, D.D., LL.D.
University of the Pacific	Santa Clara, Cal	1851	A. S. Gibbons, A.M., M.D.
Upper Iowa University	Fayette, Iowa	1858	J. W. Bissell, A.M.
Wesleyan University	Middletown, Conn	1831	C. D. Foss, D.D.
Willamette University	Salem, Oregon	1853	F. M. Gratch, D.D.

CONFERENCE SEMINARIES.

Algona College	Algona, Iowa	1872	O. H. Baker, A.M.
Albion Seminary	Albion, Iowa	1872	Samuel J. Smith, A.M.
Amenia Seminary	Amenia, N. Y	1835	S. T. Frost, A.M.
Battle Ground Collegiate Inst.	Battle Ground, Ind.	1857	George W. Rice, A.M.
Beaver College and Musical Inst.	Beaver, Pa	1873	R. T. Taylor, D.D.
Carrier Seminary	Clarion, Pa	1867	James S. Millikin, A.M.
Cazenovia Seminary	Cazenovia, N. Y	1824	W. S. Smythe, A.M.
Centenary Collegiate Inst.	Hackettstown, N.J.	1874	George B. Whitney, A.M.
Central Tennessee College	Nashville, Tenn	1866	J. Braden, D.D.
Chamberlain Inst. and Fem. Coll.	Randolph, N. Y	1850	J. T. Edwards, A.M.
Claflin University	Orangeburgh, S. C.	1869	Alonzo Webster, D.D.
Clark Theological Seminary	Atlanta, Ga	1872	James W. Lee, A.M.
Claverack Col. and Hud. Riv. In.	Claverack, N. Y	1854	Alonzo Flack, Ph.D.
Cumberland Valley Institute	Mechanicksb'gh, Pa.	1873	A. H. Ege, A.M.
East Maine Conf. Seminary	Bucksport, Me	1851	George Forsyth, A.M.
Epworth Seminary	Epworth, Iowa	1858	Adam Holm, A.M.
Fort Edward Collegiate Inst.	Fort Edward, N. Y.	1854	J. E. King, D.D., Ph.D.
Ft. Plain Sem. and Fem. Col. In.	Fort Plain, N. Y	1852	Edwin M. Sherman, A.M.
Galesville University	Galesville, Wis	1859	Harrison Gilliland, A. M.
Genesee Wesleyan Seminary	Lima, N. Y	1861	George H. Bridgman, A.M.

Name of Institution.	Place.	F'n'd	President.
Grand Prairie Sem. and Com. Col.	Onarga, Ill.	1863	John T. Dickinson, A.M.
Haven Normal School	Waynesboro', Ga.	1868	J. M'Mahen.
Hedding Female Coll. and Sem.	Abingdon, Ill.	1855	J. G. Evans, A.M.
Jennings Seminary	Aurora, Ill.	1856	C. E. Mandeville, A.M.
Johnson College	Macon, Mo.	1868	E. W. Hall, A.M.
La Junta Mission School	Tiptonville, N. M.	1873	Thomas Harwood, A.M.
Lake Shore Seminary	North East, Pa.	1873	M. G. Bullock, A.M.
Lewis College	Glasgow, Mo.	1866	James C. Hall.
Maine Wes'n Sem. and Fem. Col.	Readeville, Me.	1021	H. P. Torsey, LL.D., A.M.
Moore's Hill College	Moore's Hill, Ind.	1854	F. A. Hester, D.D.
Napa Collegiate Institute	Napa City, Cal.	1870	T. C. George, A. M.
New Egypt Sem. and Fem. Coll.	New Egypt, N. J.	1845	J. B. Robinson, A.M.
N. H. Conf. Sem. and Fem. Coll.	Tilton, N. H.	1845	J. P. Robinson, A.M.
New Orleans University	New Orleans, La.	1873	I. S. Leavitt, A.M.
N. Y. Conf. Sem. and Coll. Inst.		1851	S. Sias. A.M., M.D.
Passaic Collegiate Institute	Passaic, N. J.		John A. Munroe, A.M.
Pennington Sem. and Fe. Col. In.	Pennington, N. J.	1841	Joseph A. Dilks, A.M.
Portland Academy and Fe. Sem	Portland, Oregon	1850	T. F. Royal, A.M.
Providence Conf. Seminary	E. Greenwich, R. I.		F. D. Blakeslee, A.B.
Quincy English and German Col.	Quincy, Ill.	1856	Charles W. Brown, A.M.
Richmond Normal School	Richmond, Va.	1867	R. M. Manly.
Rock River Seminary	Mount Morris, Ill.	1839	N. C. Dougherty, A.M.
Rocky Mountain Seminary	Salt Lake, Utah.	1873	F. S. Stein, A.M.
Rust Biblical and Normal Inst.	Huntsville, Ala.	1870	Miss Mary C. Owen.
Shaw University	Holly Springs, Mass	1870	A. C. M'Donald, A.M.
Stockwell Col. Nor. and Com. In.	Stockwell, Ind.	1859	J. G. Laird, A.M.
Troy Conference Academy	Poultney, Vt.	1834	J. Newman, D. D.
Umpqua Academy	Wilbur, Oregon	1854	J. G. Herron, A.M.
Vancouver Seminary	Vancouver, W. T.	1866	E. D. Curtis, A.M.
Vermont Meth. Sem. and Fe. Col.	Mountpelier, Vt.	1865	J. C. Watson Coxe, A.M.
Vineland Seminary	Vineland, N. J.	1873	
Wesleyan Academy	Wilbraham, Mass.	1818	Edward Cooke, D.D.
Western Iowa Collegiate Inst.	Glenwood, Iowa	1866	E. N. Warren, A.M.
Western Reserve Seminary	W. Farringdon, O.	1855	F. D. Reeve, A.M.
West River Classical Institute	West River, Md.	1851	R. L. Chaney, A.M.
Wiley University	Marshall, Texas.	1873	F. Carson Moore.
Williamsport Dickinson Sem.	Williamsport, Pa.	1848	Edward J. Gray, A.M.
Wilmington Conf. Academy	Dover, Del.	1873	I. W. Williams, A.M.
Worthington Seminary	Worthington, Minn.	1874	B. H. Crever, A.M.
Wyoming Seminary	Wyoming, Pa.	1844	David Copeland, A.M.
Xenia College	Xenia, Ohio.	1850	William Smith, A.M.

Female Colleges.

Baltimore Female College	Baltimore, Md.	1849	Nathan B. Brooks, LL.D.
Bordentown Female College	Bordentown, N. J.	1852	John H. Brakeley, Ph.D.
Cincinnati Wesleyan College	Cincinnati, Ohio.	1842	Rev. Dr. Moore.
De Pauw College	New Albany, Ind.	1846	Erastus Rowley, D.D.
Drew Ladies' Seminary	Carmel, N. Y.	1866	George C. Smith, A.M.
Family and Day School for Young Ladies	New York City.	1857	D. C. Van Norman, LL.D.
Hillsborough Female College	Hillsborough, Ohio.	1839	J. M'D. Matthews, A.M.
Illinois Female College	Jackson, Ill.	1847	W. H. De Motte.
Lassell Female Seminary	Auburndale, Mass.	1851	Ch. W. Cushing, A.M.
Ohio Wesleyan Female College	Delaware, Ohio.	1853	William Richardson.
Pittsburgh Female College	Pittsburgh, Pa.	1854	I. C. Pershing, D.D.
Science Hill Female Academy	Shelbyville, Ky.	1825	Mrs. Julia A. Tevis.
Wesleyan Female College	Wilmington, Del.	1873	John Wilson, A.M.
Woman's Col. of N. W. Univer.	Evanston, Ill.	1855	Miss F. E. Willard, A.M.

Aggregate.

Theological Seminaries	6
Colleges and Universities	25
Conference Seminaries	61
Female Colleges	14
Total	106

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS OF LEARNING OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

DENOMINATION.	Seminaries.	Professors.	Students.
Roman Catholic	18	144	1,238
Baptist	16	58	936
Presbyterian	15	74	617
Lutheran	13	52	426
Protestant Episcopal	12	56	294
Congregational	8	50	329
Methodist Episcopal	7	58	321
Reformed	3	10	87
United Presbyterian	3	12	89
Christian	2	8	82
Free Baptist	2	10	45
Methodist	2	1	48
Universalist	2	10	27
African Methodist Episcopal	1	5	8
Cumberland Presbyterian	1	4	12
German Reformed	1	3	10
Methodist Episcopal (South)	1	..	..
Moravian	1	3	17
New Jerusalem	1	..	..
Union Evangelical	1	5	20
United Brethren	1	3	19
Unitarian	1	7	12
Unsectarian	1	6	19
Total	113	579	3,450

SUMMARY FROM THE BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

	1870.	1871.	1872.	1873.	1874.
Number of Institutions	80	94	110	110	113
Number of Instructors	339	369	435	573	579
Number of Students	3,254	3,204	3,351	3,338	4,356

SECULAR EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

STATES AND TERRITORIES.	School Age.	STATES AND TERRITORIES.	School Age.
Connecticut	4–16	New York	5–21
Utah	4–16	Virginia	5–21
Oregon	4–20	Colorado	5–21
Wisconsin	4–20	Dakota	5–21
Maine	4–21	Idaho	5–21
New Hampshire	4–21	South Carolina	6–16
Montana	4–21	Indian	6–16
Washington	4–21	District of Columbia	6–17
Massachusetts	5–15	Georgia	6–18
Rhode Island	5–15	Nevada	6–18
California	5–17	Tennessee	6–18
New Jersey	5–18	Texas	6–18
Michigan	5–20	Kentucky	6–20
Vermont	5–20	Florida	6–21
Wyoming	5–20	Illinois	6 21
Alabama	5–21	Indiana	6–21
Arkansas	5–21	Louisiana	6–21
Delaware	5–21	Maryland	*6–21
Iowa	5–21	North Carolina	6–21
Kansas	5–21	Ohio	6–21
Minnesota	5–21	Pennsylvania	6–21
Mississippi	5–21	West Virginia	6–21
Missouri	5–21	Arizona	6–21
Nebraska	5–21	New Mexico	No Report.

* This is the *legal* school age. The School-tax is distributed in proportion to population between 5 and 20, and the school population reported is between the latter ages.

SCHOOL STATISTICS FOR 1871, 1872, 1873, 1874.

	Year.	Number reporting. States.	Number reporting. Territories.	In States.	In Territories.
School popu'ation	1871	29	..	9,632,969	.....
School population	1872	37	7	12,740,751	88,097
School population	1873	37	11	13,324,797	134,128
School population	1874	37	11	13,735,672	139,378
Number enrolled in public schools	1871	28	..	6,393,085	.....
Number enrolled in public schools	1872	34	7	7,327,415	52,241
Number enrolled in public schools	1873	35	10	7,865,628	69,968
Number enrolled in public schools	1874	34	11	8,030,772	69,209
Number in daily attendance	1871	25	..	3,661,739	.....
Number in daily attendance	1872	28	4	4,081,569	28,956
Number in daily attendance	1873	31	5	4,166,062	33,677
Number in daily attendance	1874	30	4	4,488,075	33,489
Number of pupils in private schools	1871	14	..	328,170	.....
Number of pupils in private schools	1872	18	5	356,691	7,592
Number of pupils in private schools	1873	22	5	472,483	7,850
Number of pupils in private schools	1874	13	5	352,460	10,123
Total number of teachers	1871	26	..	180,635	.....
Total number of teachers	1872	33	7	216,062	1,177
Total number of teachers	1873	35	6	215,210	1,511
Total number of teachers	1874	35	8	*239,873	1,427
Number of male teachers	1871	24	..	66,949	.....
Number of female teachers	1871	24	..	108,743	.....
Number of male teachers	1872	30	6	81,135	374
Number of female teachers	1872	30	6	123,547	363
Number of male teachers	1873	28	5	75,321	529
Number of female teachers	1873	28	5	103,734	786
Number of male teachers	1874	28	7	87,395	499
Number of female teachers	1874	28	7	129,049	731
Public school income	1871	30	..	64,594,919	.....
Public school income	1872	35	6	71,988,718	641,551
Public school income	1873	35	10	80,081,583	844,666
Public school income	1874	37	10	81,277,636	881,209
Public school expenditure	1871	24	..	61,179,221	.....
Public school expenditure	1872	31	6	70,035,925	856,056
Public school expenditure	1873	36	10	77,780,016	995,422
Public school expenditure	1874	35	9	74,169,217	895,121
Permanent school fund	1871	10	..	41,466,854	.....
Permanent school fund	1872	31	1	65,850,572	64,385
Permanent school fund	1873	28	1	77,870,887	137,507
Permanent school fund	1874	28	..	75,251,008	.....

* Including 208 teachers of evening schools.

SCHOOL EXPENSES FOR EACH SCHOLAR.

States and Ter.	Of sch'l pop'n.	In public sch's.	States and Ter.	Of sch'l pop'n.	In public sch's.
Massachusetts	$14 70	$14 48	Minnesota	$4 06	$6 63
Ohio	11 40	8 57	Missouri	3 00	5 70
Louisiana	11 00	.. ..	Mississippi	2 89	4 54
Nebraska	10 72	18 50	Tennessee	2 09	3 40
Rhode Island	10 40	11 55	Virginia	2 02	5 08
Connecticut	0 47	10 83	South Carolina	1 95	4 28
Vermont	7 04	8 89	Alabama	0 87½	.. ..
New York	6 94	10 61	Georgia	0 68	1 95
Iowa	6 68	9 29	New Hampshire	.. ..	7 05
Michigan	5 85	7 80	Florida	.. ..	6 59
New Jersey	5 82	9 30	District of Columbia	10 70	18 98
Indiana	5 70	9 02	Montana	7 90	15 68
Illinois	5 60	7 82	Colorado	7 28	18 84
Maine	4 94	8 72	Arizona	4 41	33 28
Maryland	4 51	9 17	Utah	2 73	5 09
Wisconsin	4 16	6 80	Cherokee Nation	7 40	15 25
West Virginia	4 14	.. ..			

AVERAGE MONTHLY WAGES OF PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS.

STATE OR TERRITORY.	Male.	Female.	STATE OR TERRITORY.	Male.	Female.
Alabama	$42 50	$42 50	New Jersey	$57 34	$32 43
Arkansas	.. ..	.. ..	New York	.. ..	.. ..
California	74 58	60 60	North Carolina	25 00	20 00
Connecticut	66 56	32 69	Ohio	42 00	29 00
Delaware	.. ..	.. ..	Oregon	50 00	40 00
Florida	30 00	30 00	Pennsylvania	41 71	34 60
Georgia	55 54	38 37	Rhode Island	39 72	39 72
Illinois	50 00	39 00	South Carolina	35 00	35 00
Indiana	.. ..	.. ..	Tennessee	.. ..	.. ..
Iowa	36 04	29 32	Texas	.. ..	.. ..
Kansas	40 20	31 50	Vermont	.. ..	.. ..
Kentucky	.. ..	.. ..	Virginia	30 32	28 21
Louisiana	65 00	65 00	West Virginia	34 95	32 15
Maine	33 17	14 40	Wisconsin	.. ..	.. ..
Maryland	45 83	45 83			
Massachusetts	85 09	32 39	Arizona Territory	100 00	75 00
Michigan	49 92	27 21	Colorado Territory	69 00	54 00
Minnesota	37 39	24 57	Dakota Territory	55 00	32 00
Mississippi	58 90	58 90	District of Columbia	109 50	70 00
Missouri	35 00	35 00	Idaho Territory	162 50	162 50
Nebraska	38 50	33 48	New Mexico Territory	.. ..	.. ..
Nevada	116 53	88 73	Utah Territory	.. ..	.. ..
New Hampshire	37 56	24 33	Washington Territory	36 00	30 00

INSTITUTIONS, INSTRUCTORS, AND PUPILS.

	1871.			1872.		
	Schools.	Teach's.	Pupils.	Schools.	Teach's.	Pupils.
City-schools	...	19,448	1,415,172	...	23.194	1,215.897
Normal schools	65	445	10,922	98	773	11.778
Business-colleges	60	168	6,460	53	263	8,451
Academies	638	3,171	80,227	811	4,501	98,929
Preparatory schools*	...	....	.....	...	....	.....
Scientific and Agricultural sch's.	41	303	3.303	70	724	5.395
Colleges for women	136	1,163	12,341	175	1.617	11,288
Colleges	290	2,962	49,827	298	3,040	45.617
Theological schools	94	369	3,204	104	435	3,351
Medical schools†	82	750	7,045	87	726	5.995
Law-schools	39	129	1.722	37	151	1,976
		1873.			1874.	
City-schools	...	27,726	1,564,663	(‡)	16,438	976,837
Normal schools	114	887	16,620	124	966	24,405
Business-colleges	112	514	22,397	126	577	25,892
Academies	944	5,058	118,570	1,031	5,466	98,179
Preparatory schools‡	86	690	12.487	91	697	11.414
Scientific and Agricultural sch's.	70	747	8,950	72	600	7.244
Colleges for women	205	2,120	24.616	209	2,285	23,445
Colleges	323	3,106	52 053	343	3.783	56,692
Theological schools	110	573	3,838	113	579	4.356
Medical schools	94	1,148	8,681	99	1,121	9.095
Law-schools	37	158	2.112	38	181	2,585

* From 1870–72, inclusive, this class of schools was included in the table of academies.
† Including schools of pharmacy and dentistry.
‡ Only 127 cities are included, in place of 533 cities and towns reported in 1873.

SCHOOLS FOR DEAF AND DUMB.

Number of schools	40	Volumes in library	27,907
Total instructors	275	Value of property	$6,185,264
Male students	2,774	State appropriation	1,064,406
Female students	2,126	From tuition	127,946
Total students	4.900	Expenditures past year	1,177,498
Students from the first	14,762		

Schools for the Blind.

Number of schools	29	Value of property	$3,533,148
Total instructors	525	State appropriation past year	520,444
Number of pupils	1,942	From tuition, etc	75,026
Number from the first	6,684	Expenditures past year	638,988
Volumes in library	8,044		

Reform Schools.

Number of schools	56	Whites	9,349
Officers and teachers	693	Colored	637
Number admitted during year	9,846	Native	4,991
Number discharged	8,023	Foreign	973
Male inmates	7,951	Annual cost	$1,541,799
Female inmates	2,897		

Orphan Asylums.

Number of	156	Total from first	112,410
Officers and teachers	924	Volumes in library	30,712
Male inmates	7,178	Income	$1,886,533
Female inmates	5,631	Expenditure	1,293,578
Total inmates	12,979		

Soldiers' Orphans' Homes.

Number of	21	Total from first	10,699
Officers and teachers	257	Volumes in library	8,262
Male inmates	2,078	Income	$260,297
Female inmates	1,198	Expenditures	244,123
Total inmates	3,276		

Infant Asylums.

Number of	9	Inmates	546
Officers and teachers	19	Income	$53,771

Industrial Schools.

Number of	26	Female inmates	5,071
Officers and teachers	259	Total inmates	6,096
Male inmates	697	Total from first	82,709

SOME COLLEGE ITEMS.

College Graduates in Congress.

	41st Congress.			42d Congress.		
	Senate.	H. Rep.	Both	Senate.	H. Rep.	Both.
Total number of members	72	239	311	74	243	317
Number of college graduates	33	75	108	34	77	111
Per cent. of college graduates	46	31	34	46	31	35
Number of Harvard graduates	2	2	4	2	1	3
Number of Yale graduates	1	5	6	1	8	9
Number of Princeton graduates	2	5	7	3	1	4
Total of these three colleges	5	12	17	6	10	16

The Occupations of 4,218 Graduates of certain New England Colleges.

Graduates of	Theology.	Law.	Medicine.	Instruction.	Journalism	Agriculture.	Business.	Total so far as known.
Harvard	144	252	173	53	..	..	...	622
Wesleyan	253	102	33	171	1	1	9	570
Yale	418	603	164	182	33	61	306	1,772
Dartmouth	285	440	179	213	8	..	129	1,254
Total	1,100	1,402	549	619	42	62	444	4,218

THE AGE AT GRADUATION OF 5,806 NEW ENGLAND COLLEGE GRADUATES.

Graduating at age of	Har'd.	Wes'n.	Yale.	Dart'th.	Total.	Graduating at age of	Har'd.	Wes'n.	Yale.	Dart'th.	Total.
16	2	..	..	..	2	28	6	20	41	58	125
17	11	..	..	3	14	29	5	21	16	30	72
18	113	10	30	15	168	30	2	12	10	15	39
19	327	13	174	52	566	31	..	2	4	8	14
20	478	43	351	106	978	32	1	2	1	4	8
21	348	47	397	174	966	33	..	1	2	..	3
22	150	66	300	163	679	34	..	1	1	1	3
23	77	45	193	175	490	35	..	..	..	1	1
24	44	44	148	146	382	38	..	1	..	1	2
25	34	45	121	156	356						
26	16	55	69	124	264	Total...	1,630	451	1,907	1,318	5,306
27	16	23	49	86	174						

DEGREES CONFERRED IN ALL COLLEGES, 1875.

	In Course.	Honorary.		In Course.	Honorary
In Letters	3,476	149	In Medicine	2,845	2
In Science	812	9	In Law	939	78
In Philosophy	85	15	Others	68	...
In Art	4	...			
In Theology	630	193	Total	8.859	441

UPON WOMEN.

In Letters	519	...	Others	279	...
In Science	40	...			
In Art	4	...	Total	860	...

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF BENEFACTIONS, BY INSTITUTIONS, FOR 1873.

INSTITUTIONS.	Endowment and general purposes.	Grounds, buildings, and apparatus.	Professorships.	Fellowships, scholarships, and prizes.	Library and Mus'm.	Total.
Colleges	$6,075,325	$1,272,902	$578,575	$244,295	$67,044	$8,238,141
Schools of science	521,112	178,681	65,600	14,765	500	780,658
Schools of theology	219,258	33,200	340,000	26,843	500	619,801
Medical colleges, etc	66,100	6,000	.....	1,000	5,500	78,600
Institutions for superior instruction of women	221,425	11,500	2,500	16,000	580	252,005
Secondary instruction	357,606	209,885	.....	7,500	250	575,241
Libraries	188,011	150,000	.....	.....	41,000	379,011
Museums of nat. hist	.....	.....	.....	.....	131,680	131,680
Deaf and dumb	3,500	.....	.....	.....	500	4,000
Blind	.....	15,000	.....	.....	....	15,000
Peabody fund	135,840	.....	.....	.....	....	135,840
Miscellaneous	17,000	.....	.....	.....	....	17,000
Total	7,805,177	1,877,168	986,675	310,403	247,551	11,226,977

STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF BENEFACTIONS, BY INSTITUTIONS, FOR 1874.

INSTITUTIONS.	Endowment and general purposes.	Grounds, buildings, apparatus.	Fellowships, scholarships, and prizes.	Aid for indig't stud's.	Library and Museum.	Object not specified.	Total.
Univ'ties and coll	1,222,992	$373,329	$26,035	$33,525	$9,130	$683,431	*$845,354
Schools of science	174,327	230,676	11,416	3,885	500	1,000	481,804
Schools of theology	603,527	292,893	13,750	2,959	40,500	158,000	1,111,629
Schools of medicine	18,500	10,750	500	500	....	4,281	†44,531
Inst. for superior instruct. of women	207,300	20,500	500	....	9,120	4,000	241,420
Preparatory sch'ls	547,600	71,335	1,380	66,650	35,125	1,000	723,040
Inst. for second. in.	151,461	82,324	1,310	10,200	1,355	25,631	272,281
Libraries	40,790	....	....	....	34,632	....	75,422
Deaf & Dumb Inst.	3,053	1,000	....	....	....	3,270	7,323
Miscellaneous	1,150,500	100,000	....	....	....	....	1,250,500
Total	$4,120,050	1,242,807	54,841	117,719	130,362	265,525	6,053,304

* This amount includes for Professorships $12,000. † Includes for Professorships $10,000.

Summary of the Number of Educational Publications, 1874.

Number of Firms in		Number of Books published on	
California	3	Art	39
Connecticut	6	Biography	69
Illinois	7	Education	142
Indiana	1	Geography and travels	38
Iowa	2	History	90
Kentucky	1	Law	74
Maine	2	Logic and metaphysics	12
Maryland	1	Mathematics	24
Massachusetts	29	Mechanics	20
Missouri	2	Medicine	40
New York	80	Natural sciences	77
Ohio	10	Philology and translations	35
Pennsylvania	31	Political economy and social science	21
Tennessee	1	Theology and religion	100
Virginia	1	Miscellaneous	9
Wisconsin	1		
District of Columbia	3	Total	884
Total	181		

Illiteracy in the United States.

Total population in 1870, ten years old and over	28,238,945
Illiterate population, ten years old and over	5,658,144
Male population, ten years old and over	14,258,866
Illiterate males, ten years old and over	2,603,888
Female population, ten years old and over	13,970,079
Illiterate females, ten years old and over	3,054,256
Total male adults, 1870	9,443,001
Male adult illiterates	1,619,147
Total female adults	9,092,999
Female adult illiterates	2,096,049
Percentage of male illiterate adults to total adults	17.15
Percentage of female illiterate adults to total females	23.05

Illiteracy in Pennsylvania.

The whole number of persons received into the Eastern State Penitentiary from October 25, 1829, to December 31, 1874, is 7,828, namely:—

White.	Number.	Per cent.	Colored.	Number.	Per cent.
Males	6,083	77.71	Males	1,386	17.71
Females	216	2.76	Female	143	1.82
Total	6,299	80.47	Total	1,529	19.53

SEX.

Minors.	Number.	Per cent.	Adults.	Number.	Per cent.
White males	1,091	13.94	White males	4,990	63.05
White females	60	.77	White females	156	1.99
Mulatto males	157	2.01	Mulatto males	398	5.80
Mulatto females	36	.45	Mulatto females	38	.48
Black males	209	2.67	Black males	624	7.97
Black females	33	.42	Black females	36	1.45
Total	1,586	20.26	Total	6,242	79.74

AGE.

	Number.	Per cent.		Number.	Per cent.
Under 18	355	4.51	40 to 45	392	5.01
18 to 21	1,231	15.73	45 to 50	313	3.19
21 to 25	1,977	25.26	50 to 60	293	3.74
25 to 30	1,628	20.80	60 to 70	103	1.33
30 to 35	869	11.10	70 to 80	13	.17
35 to 40	650	8.35	80 to 90	1	.01
Total under 40	6,713	85.75	Total above 40	1,115	14.25

SOCIAL RELATIONS.

Parental.	Number.	Per cent.	Conjugal.	Number.	Per cent.
Parents dead	2,533	32.36	Unmarried	4,500	57.48
Parents living	2,376	30.35	Married	2,844	36.33
Mother living	1,968	25.14	Separated	90	1.15
Father living	951	12.15	Widowers	348	4.45
			Widows	46	.59
Total	7,828	100.00			
			Total	7,828	100.00

EDUCATIONAL AND MORAL RELATIONS.

Educational.	Number.	Per cent.	Habits.	Number.	Per cent.
Illiterate	1,585	20.35	Abstainers	1,809	23.11
Read only	1,138	14.54	Moderate drinkers	3 206	40.96
Read and write	5,063	64.67	Sometimes intoxicated	1,295	16.54
Well instructed	42	.54	Often intoxicated	1,518	19.39
Total	7,828	100.00	Total	7,828	100.00

LATEST COMPARATIVE STATISTICS.

Relations, etc.	Received from 1841 to 1853.	Received from 1854 to 1866.	Received from 1867 to 1870.	Received from 1871 to 1875.
Whole number received	817	1,314	625	541
COLOR AND SEX.				
White males	575	1,058	430	357
White females	15	40	8	7
Colored males	207	198	185	174
Colored females	23	18	2	3
AGE.				
Under 21 years	186	359	134	189
21 to 25 years	218	361	183	164
25 years and upward	413	594	308	188
EDUCATIONAL.				
Illiterate	164	221	148	165
Read only	154	195	115	40
Read and write	499	898	32	336
INDUSTRIAL.				
Not bound	576	1,077	633	474
Bound and left	154	153	58	42
Bound and served till 21 years of age	87	84	34	25
PARENTAL.				
Parents dead	253	337	218	168
Parents living	208	432	164	193
Mother living	272	353	193	94
Father living	84	192	50	86
CRIMES.				
Against property	653	1,109	514	444
Against persons	164	205	111	97

EDUCATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES.

ENGLAND AND WALES.

Whole population	22,712,266	School attendance to popu'tion as 1 to 17	
School population	5,374,801	At marriage, can't write, male, 1 out of 5	
Per cent of total population	23	At marriage, can't write, female, 1 out of 4	
Children registered	2,497,602	In Wales, cannot write, female, 1 out of 2	
Childhood age	3 to 13		

FRANCE.

Whole population	38,067,094	Number of scholars	3,625,000
Number of schools	145,000	School attendance to population as 1 to 21	
Number of teachers	86,793		

ILLITERACY, (CENSUS OF 1872.)

Degree of Education.	Under 6. Total.	Under 6. Per cent.	From 6 to 20. Total.	From 6 to 20. Per cent.	Above 20. Total.	Above 20. Per cent.	Per cent. of total above 6.
Unable to read or write	3,540,101	88.85	2,082,338	23.89	7,702,862	33.37	30.77
Able to read only	292,348	7.33	1,175,125	13.48	2,305,130	9.99	10.94
Able to read and write.	151,595	3.82	5,458,097	62.63	13,073,057	56.64	58.29
Unascertained	38,042	....	70,721	....	214,005	....	....
Total.....	4,022,086	....	8,786,281	....	23,294,554	....	....

GERMANY.

Whole population	41,060,695	Normal schools.....	169
Number of elementary sch'ls.	60,000	Educational periodicals.....	63
Number of teachers.....	109,000	No national system of education.	
School population.....	6,569,711	Each of the 26 States has a system of its	
School attendance	6,000,000	own.	

ILLITERACY IN PRUSSIA.

Degree of Education.	Above 10 years of age. Males.	Females.	Total.
Able to read and write	8,112,051	7,926,901	16,038,952
Ability to read and write not ascertained....	118,863	158,709	277,572
Not able to read and write.....	863,843	1,896,434	2,260,277

In percentages the result is the following: Out of every 10,000 inhabitants above 10 years of age, 950 men (or 9.5 per cent.) and 1,473 women (14.73 per cent.) are illiterate.

According to religion, the illiterates are grouped in the following manner:—

Religion.	Males. Number.	Males. Per cent.	Females. Number.	Females. Per cent.
Protestants	390,117	6.60	693,400	11.37
Catholics.....	464,755	15.16	685,535	21.31
Jews.....	7,976	6.65	16,648	12.53
Dissenters.....	995	4.96	1,851	9.02

In 1874 the total number of conscripts was 33,333. Of these 3,324, or 3.98 per cent., were not able to read and write. The highest percentage of illiterates was in the province of Posen, 16 per cent.; in Prussia, 11 per cent.

BELGIUM.

Whole population..... 5,687,105 | School expenses, 1874..... $1,040,325
Illiterate adult population, 30 per cent.

COMPARATIVE STATISTICS OF EUROPEAN SCHOOL ATTENDANCE.

[On the calculation that the children between 6 and 12 constitute the sixth part of the European popular'n.]

In Saxony the school attendance is to the population as 1 to 5; in Norway, as 1 to 6; in Prussia, as 1 to 7; in Denmark, as 1 to 7½; in Netherlands, as 1 to 8; in Scotland, as 1 to 9; in Protestant Switzerland, as 1 to 9; in Austria, as 1 to 10; in Belgium, as 1 to 10½; in Ireland, as 1 to 16; in Catholic Switzerland, as 1 to 16; in England, as 1 to 17; in France, as 1 to 21; in Lombardy, as 1 to 30; in Sardinia, as 1 to 64; in Portugal, as 1 to 80; in Italy, as 1 to 100; in Greece, as 1 to 118; in Spain, as 1 to 170; in Russia, as 1 to 700.—*London School-Board Chronicle*, Mar. 6, 1875.

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS.

1. NATIONAL EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATION.—This Convention met at Detroit, Mich., August 4, 1874. Delegates present, 600; States represented, 39; Territories represented, 2. Among other important matters discussed was the establishing of a National University. Place of next meeting, Minneapolis, Wisconsin.

2. AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE.—The Twenty-third Session of this Association met at Hartford, Connecticut, August 12, 1874. At that session 44 new members were admitted. Many difficult subjects in science were ably discussed. Prof. J. E. Hilgard, of Washington, D. C., was elected President for the ensuing year. Place of meeting, Detroit, Mich. Time of meeting, second Wednesday of August.

3. AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION.—This Association held its sixth Annual Session in Hartford, Conn., July 14, 1874. Among topics discussed were these: 1. The necessity of reform in the spelling of the English language. 2. The advantage of a universal alphabet.

4. AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY.—This Society met in New York, October 28, 1874. As its name indicates, it is specially devoted to the study of inscriptions, hieroglyphics, and ancient Oriental literature.

5. THE AMERICAN ANTIQUARIAN SOCIETY.—The annual meeting of this Society was held in Worcester, Mass., October 21, 1874. This Society is chiefly devoted to preserving a consecutive history of the past in American history.

6. AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.—The yearly session of this Institute was held at North Adams, Mass., September, 1874. This was its forty-fifth regular session. It discusses the various modes of education in our schools and colleges.

7. CENTENNIAL OF CHEMISTRY.—A meeting was held in Northumberland, Pa., July 31, 1874, to celebrate the hundredth anniversary of Priestley, the discoverer of chemistry. This meeting was held in connection with a meeting in Birmingham, England, for the purpose of unvailing a marble statue of the great discoverer. Telegraph communications were exchanged. In the evening about five hundred persons visited Priestley's grave at Northumberland.

8. MEETING OF COLLEGE PRESIDENTS.—This meeting was held at Hanover, N. H., November, 1874. College course of study, regattas, etc., etc., were discussed.

9. AMERICAN SOCIAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION.—This Society convened in New York, May 21, 1874. It is devoted to health, pauperism, crime, and education.

10. ASSOCIATION OF NORMAL-SCHOOL TEACHERS.—This Convention was held at Westfield, N. Y., November, 1874. It discussed questions relating to the profession of teachers. These comprise the number of national associations for the promotion of national education.

PUBLIC LIBRARIES.

Number of	340	Increase in books during past year	299,767
Number of volumes	4,663,166		
Number of pamphlets	764,944	Increase in pamphlets	88,426

CONGRESSIONAL LIBRARY, 1874.

Number of books	274,157	Increase of books for whole library, 1874	15,405
Number of pamphlets	53,000	Increase in pamphlets	6,272
Law department, number of vols.	33,712		

MUSEUMS.

Museums of Natural History	44
Museums of Art	24

PERIODICAL LITERATURE. CENSUS, 1870.

Periods of Issue.	Number.	Copies ann'ly issued.	Circulation.
Daily	574	806,479,570	2,601,547
Tri-weekly	107	24,196,380	155,105
Semi-weekly	115	25,708,488	244,197
Weekly	4,295	550,921,436	10,594,643
Semi-monthly	96	32,395,680	1,349,820
Monthly	622	67,810,116	5,650,843
Bi-monthly	13	189,900	31,650
Quarterly	49	846,680	211,670
Total of all periods	5,871	1,508,548,250	20,842,475

Kinds.	Number.	Copies ann'ly issued.	Circulation.
Advertising	79	4,689,800	293,450
Agriculture and Horticulture	93	21,541,904	770,752
Benevolent and Sectarian Societies	81	6,518,560	257,080
Commercial and Finance	142	31,120,600	690,200
Illustrated and Literary	503	160,061,408	4,422,235
Nationality	20	4,071,000	45,150
Political	4,333	1,134,739,082	8,731,220
Religious	407	125,959,496	4,764,358
Sporting	6	3,222,000	73,500
Technical and Prof.	207	15,974,400	744,530

PERIODICALS, FROM REPORT BY ROWELL & CO., 1875.

Periods of Issue.	Number.	Periods of Issue.	Number.
Daily	718	Monthly	802
Tri-weekly	80	Bi-monthly	8
Semi-weekly	107	Quarterly	68
Weekly	5,957		
Bi weekly	24	Total	7,870
Semi-monthly	106		

INCREASE IN FIVE YEARS.

Dailies	144		Monthly	180
Tri-weekly	*d.* 27		Bi-monthly	*d.* 5
Semi-weekly	*d.* 8		Quarterly	19
Weekly	1,662			
Semi-monthly	10		Net increase	1,985

The States leading in the newspaper work are as follows:—

States.	Daily.	Weekly.	Cop. iss'd an.	States.	Daily.	Weekly.	Cop. iss'd an.
New York	100	690	492,770,868	Ohio	35	407	93,592,448
Pennsylvania	78	511	233,380 532	Missouri	30	314	47,980 422
Illinois	39	503	113,140,492	Indiana	30	295	26,964,984
California	34	141	45,869,498	Iowa	24	322	16,408,380
Massachusetts	24	229	107,691,952	New Jersey	23	141	18,625,740

As compared with other nations, the United States stands about as follows:—

	Newspapers.	Inhabitants.		Newspapers.	Inhabitants.
United States	7,870, 1 to each	5,000	Belgium	275, 1 to each	15,000
Great Britain	1,260, 1 to each	22,000	Holland	225, 1 to each	16,000
France	1,640, 1 to each	23,000	Russia	200, 1 to each	330,000
Prussia	700, 1 to each	26,000	Spain	200, 1 to each	75,000
Italy	506, 1 to each	44,000	Norway & Sweden	150, 1 to each	36,000
Austria	365, 1 to each	105,000	Denmark	100, 1 to each	20,000
Switzerland	300, 1 to each	8,000	Turkey	100, 1 to each	300,000

NATIONAL AND CENTENNIAL.

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT.

President, U. S. Grant, Illinois; *Acting Vice-President*, T. W. Ferry, Michigan; *Secretary of State*, Hamilton Fish, N. Y.; *Secretary of Treasury*, B. H. Bristow, Ky.; *Secretary of War*, Judge Taft, Ohio; *Secretary of Navy*, G. W. Robeson, N. J.; *Secretary of Interior*, B. Chandler, Mich.; *Postmaster-General*, Marshall Jewell, Conn.; *Attorney-General*, Edw. Pierrepont, N. Y.; *Chief-Justice*, M. R. Waite, Ohio; *General*, W. T. Sherman, St. Louis, Mo.; *Lieut-General*, P. H. Sheridan, Chicago, Ill.; *Admiral*, David D. Porter, Washington; *Vice-Admiral*, S. C. Rowan, Washington.

UNITED STATES CENTENNIAL COMMISSION.

President, Hon. Joseph R. Hawley; *Vice-Presidents*, Alfred T. Goshorn, Orestes Cleveland, William M. Byrd, John D. Creigh, David Atwood, Thomas H. Caldwell; *Director General*, Alfred T. Goshorn; *Secretary*, John L. Campbell; *Counselor and Solicitor*, John L. Shoemaker.

CENTENNIAL BOARD OF FINANCE.

President, John Welsh, Phila.; *Vice-Presidents*, William Sellers, Phila., one vacancy; *Directors*, John Welsh, William Sellers, Samuel M. Felton, Joseph Patterson, Daniel M. Fox, Fairman Rogers, John Wanamaker, John P. Wetherel, Edwin H. Fitler, Thomas Cochran, Clement M. Biddle, N. Parker Shortridge, James M. Robb, Edward T. Steele, Phila.; Charles W. Cooper, Allentown; Robert M. Patton, Alabama; Benjamin F. Allen, Iowa; John Cummins, Mass.; A. S. Hewitt, N. J.; John Gorman, Rhode Island; John L. Barbour, Virginia. *Secretary and Treasurer*, Frederick Fraley, Philadelphia.

NATIONS AT THE UNITED STATES CENTENNIAL.

An official invitation having been extended by the President of the United States to foreign governments to co-operate in the exhibition, the following nations have accepted: Argentine Confederation, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chili, China, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, France and Algeria, Germany, Great Britain with Australia and Canada, Guatemala and Salvador, Hawaii, Hayti, Honduras, Italy, Japan, Liberia, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Austria, Hungary, Orange Free State Persia, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Siam, Spain, Sweden, Tunis, Turkey, U. S. of Columbia, Venezuela. Total, 38.

The names and size of buildings are as follows:—

	Length in feet.	Width in feet.	Acres.		Length in feet.	Width in feet.	Acres.
Main building	1,876	464	21.47	Agricultural building	820	125	10
Art Gallery	365	210	1.5	Horticultural build'g	383	193	15
Machinery building	1,402	330	14.				

Total space covered by buildings and grounds, 234 acres. There are other buildings erected by foreign nations. Total space devoted to the Exhibition is 450 acres.

CENTENNIAL CALENDAR, 1876.

Reception of articles begins ..	Jan. 5.	Exhibition opens	May 10.
Reception of articles ends....	April 19.	Exhibition closes	Nov. 19.
Unoccupied space forfeited...	April 26.	Goods to be removed by.....	Dec. 31.

AMERICAN WARS.

	Between Nations.	Began.	Lasted.
Dutch.....	Dutch and Indians.....	1673	6 months.
King Philip's	English and Indians.....	1675	1 year.
King William's.....	English and French.....	1689	8 years.
Queen Anne's.....	English and French.....	1702	11 years.
King George's.....	French and English.....	1746	4 years.
French and Indian.....	French and Indians	1753	7 years.
American Revolution.....	England and America	1775	8 years.
Indian.....	United States and Indians....	1790	5 years.
Barbary	United States and Barbary ...	1803	2 years.
Tecumseh.....	United States and Indians....	1811	1 year.
War of.....	United States and Great Britain	1812	3 years.
Algerine Pirates.....	United States and Algiers....	1815	2 months.
First Seminole.....	United States and Indians....	1817	1 year.
Second Seminole.....	United States and Indians....	1835	7 years.
Black Hawk.....	United States and Indians....	1832	8 months.
Mexican.....	United States and Indians....	1846	2 years.
Southern Rebellion.....	Southern Rebellion.....	1861	4 years.

Battles of the Revolution.

Lexington (first skirmish).	April 19, 1775	Monmouth	June 28, 1778
Ticonderoga	May 10, 1775	Wyoming	July 4, 1778
Bunker Hill	June 17, 1775	Quaker Hill, R. I.	Aug. 29, 1778
Montreal (Ethan Allen ta'n)	Sept. 25, 1775	Savannah	Dec. 29, 1778
St. Johns besieged and captured	Nov. 3, 1775 – Dec. 9, 1775	Kettle Creek, Ga.	Feb. 14, 1779
		Brier Creek	Mar. 3, 1779
Great Bridge, Va.	Dec. 31, 1775	Stony Ferry	June 20, 1779
Quebec (Montgomery kil'd)	Feb. 27, 1776	Stony Point	July 16, 1779
Moore's Creek Bridge	Mar. 17, 1776	Paulus' Hook	Aug. 13, 1779
Boston (British fled)	June 28, 1776	Chemung (Indians)	Aug. 29, 1779
Ft. Sullivan, Charlestown.	Aug. 27, 1776	Savannah	Aug. 9, 1779
Long Island	Sept. 16, 1776	Charlestown surrendered to the British	May 12, 1780
Harlem Plains	Oct. 28, 1776	Springfield	June 20, 1780
White Plains	Nov. 16, 1776	Rocky Mount	July 30, 1780
Fort Washington	Dec. 27, 1776	Hanging Rock	Aug. 6, 1780
Trenton	Jan. 3, 1777	Sanders' Creek, Camden.	Aug. 16, 1780
Princeton	July 7, 1777	King's Mountain	Oct. 7, 1780
Hubbardton	Aug. 16, 1777	Fish Dam Ford, Br'd River	Nov. 18, 1780
Bennington	Sept. 11, 1777	Blackstocks	Nov. 20, 1780
Brandywine	Sept. 19, 1777	Cowpens	Jan. 17, 1781
First battle of Saratoga	Sept. 20, 1777	Guiboro	Mar. 15, 1781
Paoli	Oct. 4, 1777	Hookirk's Hill	April 25, 1781
Germantown		Ninety-Six (besieged)	May, June, '81
Forts Clinton and Montgomery taken	Oct. 6, 1777 – Oct. 7, 1777	Augusta (besieged)	May, June, '81
		Jamestown	July 9, 1781
Second battle of Saratoga.	Oct. 13, 1777	Eutaw Springs	Sept. 7, 1781
Surrender of Burgoyne	Oct. 22, 1777	Yorktown (Cornwallis surrendered	Oct. 19, 1781
Fort Mercer	Oct. 22, 1777		
Fort Mifflin	Nov. —, 1777		

Whole number of British troops, 134,000 | British allies, Indians and Hessians.

Whole number American troops: Continentals 230,000 | Militia 50,000 | American allies, the French.

Area and Population.

Year.	Area in sq. miles.	Population.	Year.	Area in sq. miles.	Population.
1776	800,000	3,017,678	Territory	1,619,417	457,970
1876	1,984,467	38,115,641	Present	3,603,884	38,573,611
Increase	1,184,467	35,097,963			

State population to square mile... 19.21 | Territorial population to sq. mile. 0.27

Grand total population to square mile, 10.70.

Population in 1860, 1870.

Aggregate	1870	38,573,611	Indian	1870	25,731
Aggregate	1860	31,443,321	Indian	1860	44,021
Increase in ten years		7,130,290	Decrease in ten years		18,290
White	1870	33,604,617	Territories	1870	442,730
White	1860	26,922,537	Territories	1860	259,577
Increase in ten years		6,682,080	Increase in ten years		183,153
Colored	1870	4,880,009	Deduct Indian decrease		18,290
Colored	1860	4,447,830	Actual increase in ten years.		164,863
Increase in ten years		432,179	Increase in Dist. of Columbia.		56,620
Chinese	1870	63,254	Whole Ter. increase in ten years.		221,483
Chinese	1860	34,936	State increase in ten years		6,931,897
Increase in ten years		28,318	Per cent. of increase		22.22

1776 Number of States..... 11 | 1776 Territories.....undefined

1876 Number of States..... 37 | 1876 Number of Territories 12

TOTAL POPULATION, WHITE AND COLORED, OF THE UNITED STATES, WITH THE PERCENTAGE OF DECIMAL INCREASE, FROM THE CENSUS REPORTS OF 1790 TO 1870.

	White.	Per ct.	Colored.	Per ct.		White.	Per ct.	Colored.	Per ct.
1790..	3,172,006	.....	757,363	.....	1840..	14,195,805	34.62	2,873,758	23.41
1800..	4,306,446	35.76	1,001,437	32.23	1850..	19,553,068	37.74	3,638,762	26.62
1810..	5,862,073	36.10	1,377,810	37.58	1860..	26,922,537	37.68	4,435,709	21.90
1820..	7,862,166	34.12	1,771,562	28.58	1870..	33,586,989	24.75	4,880,009	10.02
1830..	10,537,348	34.03	2,328,642	31.44					

We count Alaska in the above Territories at a population of 15,240. It is now 70,461.

NATIONAL STATISTICS.

Area.	Year.	Acres.	Sq. Miles.
The Thirteen Colonies	1776	.....	800,000
Territory ceded	1783	800,000,000	.....
Louisiana purchase	1803	.....	1,000,000
Florida purchase	1819	.....	60,000
Texas admitted	1845	.....	240,000
California and Nevada	1848	.....	.....
Alaska	1867	.....	517,390

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

In compiling the foregoing statistics it has been found impossible to give at each place the authority upon which we have relied. Indeed, we have found it impossible to do so even here. Without naming all, we may mention the Reports of the United States Census, the Reports of the Bureau of Education, Rowell's American Newspaper Directory, and the Methodist Almanac. If there shall be found any material discrepancy between the statistics in these tables and those found in the body of the work, the explanation is that these tables are the very latest official reports at hand. And in conclusion we may say that we trust that this book and these tables may be found of great use to many in the years to come. That this work will be maintained in existence even as a relic at the next national centennial we can hardly believe; but the facts here embodied may be transferred from one to another along the coming years. And while some one will doubtless at the next centennial undertake to write up the denominational facts and general statistics of the nation during its then past century, we well know that this hand will have long since been motionless in death. Hence we lay aside our pen with a feeling of sadness that such a work of pleasure as it has been to us can never be performed by us again. May it then be much better done by another. We close with the hearty adoption of Whittier's

CENTENNIAL HYMN.

Our fathers' God! from out whose hand
The centuries fall like grains of sand,
We meet to-day, united, free,
And loyal to our land and thee,
To thank thee for the era done,
And trust thee for the opening one.

Here, where of old by Thy design
The fathers spake that word of thine
Whose echo is the glad refrain
Of rended bolt and falling chain,
To grace our festal time, from all
The zones of earth our guests we call.

Be with us while the New World greets
The Old World, thronging all its streets,
Unvailing all the triumphs won
By art or toil beneath the sun;
And unto common good ordain
The rivalship of hand and brain.

Thou who hast here in concord furled
The war flags of a gathered world,
Beneath our western skies fulfill
The Orient's mission of good will,
And, freighted with Love's golden fleece,
Send back the Argonauts of peace.

For art and labor met in truce,
For beauty made the bride of use,
We thank Thee, while withal we crave
The austere virtues, strong to save—
The honor, proof to place or gold,
The manhood, never bought or sold!

O, make thou us, through centuries long,
In peace secure, in justice strong!
Around our gift of freedom draw
The safeguards of thy righteous law,
And, cast in some diviner mold,
Let the new cycle shame the old.

THE END.

PUBLISHED BY NELSON & PHILLIPS.

The Poet Preacher:

A Brief Memorial of Charles Wesley, the Eminent Preacher and Poet. By CHARLES ADAMS. Illustrated..... $1 00

The Stony Road.

A Scottish Story from Real Life. Large 16mo.. 0 85

Story of a Pocket Bible.

A Book for all Classes of Readers. Illustrated. 1 25

The Chart of Life:

Indicating the Dangers and Securities connected with the Voyage to Immortality. By Rev. JAMES PORTER, A.M., Author of "The True Evangelist," "Operative's Friend," "Revivals of Religion," etc. With an Introduction by Rev. EDWARD OTHEMAN, A.M..... 1 00

The Christian Statesman.

A Portraiture of Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton. By Z. A. MUDGE..... 1 25

The Forest Boy.

A Sketch of the Life of Abraham Lincoln. By Z. A. MUDGE. Large 16mo..... 1 25

The Mother's Mission.

Sketches from Real Life. By the Author of "The Object of Life." Illustrated..... 1 25

The Object of Life:

A Narrative illustrating the Insufficiency of the World, and the Sufficiency of Christ. With Four Illustrations..... 1 25

Witch Hill:

A History of Salem Witchcraft, including Illustrative Sketches of Persons and Places. By Rev. Z. A. MUDGE. Large 16mo..... 1 25

PUBLISHED BY NELSON & PHILLIPS.

Lindsay Lee and his Friends.
A Story for the Time. Large 16mo..... $0 75

Lives made Sublime by Faith and Works.
Large 16mo. Illustrated..... 1 50

Household Stories.
From the German of Madame OTTILLIE WILDEMUTH. By ELEANOR KINMONT. Series I. Illustrated. Large 16mo..... 1 50

My Sister Margaret.
A Temperance Story. Four Illustrations. By Mrs. C. M. EDWARDS..... 1 25

Out in the World;
Or, A Selfish Life. By HELEN J. WOLFE. Large 16mo..... 1 25

Palissy the Potter;
Or, the Huguenot, Artist, and Martyr. A True Narrative. By C. L. BRIGHTWELL. Illustrated. 1 25

Path of Life.
By D. WISE, D.D. Large 16mo..... 1 00
Gilt Edge..... 1 30

Pillars of Truth.
A Series of Sermons on the Decalogue. By E. O. HAVEN, D.D..... 1 25

Pleasant Pathways;
Or, Persuasives to Early Piety. By DANIEL WISE, D.D. Steel Engravings..... 1 25

Footprints of Roger Williams.
By Rev. Z. A. MUDGE. Large 16mo..... 1 25

Six Years in India.
By MR. HUMPHREYS..... 1 25

111732

BX
8235
W6

111732

Wood, Ezra
Methodism and the
Centennial of Amer-
ican Independence

DATE DUE	BORROWER'S NAME

Wood
Methodism...

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

PRINTED IN U.S.A.